

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. I.

OCTOBER, 1876.

No. 4.

THE CHURCH AND THE PEOPLE.

Civilization in the Nineteenth Century. By W. S. Lilly, M. A.
London Month for June, 1876.

Où Allons-nous? Par M. L'Évêque d'Orléans, Membre du Sénat.
Paris, Ch. Douniol et Cie, 1876.

IN the situation of the Church at any given time no Christian need fear that the majority of the people will ever be arrayed against the Church. Did not the birth of Christ "bring good tidings of great joy . . . to all the people?" (Luke ii. 10.) Did not our Saviour Himself declare that He came "to preach the Gospel to the poor?" (Matt. xi. 5.) Did He not bless them and denounce woe to the rich? He was Himself one of the people, lived constantly in the midst of them, took pleasure in instructing them, relieving their wants, and using His Divine power for their benefit.

Under His instructions and inspiration the Church has always manifested a motherly affection for the poor; and there is no need of expatiating on a subject so perfectly well known to all. But it is proper to insist on the great fact that the gratitude of the people toward the Church has been thus far a prominent feature of modern history. Take any part of it you choose and in all the innumerable difficulties which the Church had to encounter, the people almost invariably stood up at her side ready to defend her, and sharing generously in all her perils and vicissitudes. The exception we have just mentioned, refers to the well-known period of Protestantism at its first outbreak, when a great part of the people in Germany

embraced openly the cause of her enemies. It would be useless to look into the causes of this anomaly; it is sufficient to remark that even in the north of that country the mass of the nation would not have abandoned the cause of the Church, had it not been for the treachery of the princes. But everywhere else, even in England, the people were certainly opposed to the Reformation. They embraced it finally in Great Britain because of their belief that the change after all was not radical, since under Henry VIII. they had yet a hierarchy, the Mass, sacraments, and a certain array of festivals, together with the greater number of their former customs. The reader knows what sacrifices Ireland made to keep her faith; how ardent were the people in France against the innovators; how the common citizens of Paris itself went even to the excesses of the *Ligue* to prove their allegiance to Catholicity.

A full and impartial history of the Reformation would prove conclusively, that, if the Church was then betrayed, it was not in general by the lower classes of society, where, on the contrary, she found her stanchest defenders. But as it is with the present time that this paper is concerned, it is our duty to show briefly, first, that at this moment the great mass of the people, in all countries, is more ardently attached than ever to the cause of the Bride of Christ, and the semi-persuasion of some men who incline really to believe that the whole world, including even the lower classes of mankind, are now turning their backs on her whom they called so long their mother, is after all a mere dream, an unholy fancy, which cannot stand against the least discussion. This requires a moment's attention before coming to inquire how far the people have been tainted by the false ideas of the age, and what is the real extent of the danger, in that respect, for the future.

How can the Church be imagined without the people around her? Are not her instructions, her sacraments, her festivals, her processions, pilgrimages, and ceremonies chiefly for them? Is it not the people that surround her prelates, her priests, her ministers of any degree on all those occasions? Is not the love, the veneration of the lower orders, as they are called, bright as the light of day whenever she comes out for any purpose whatever? It is, we are sure, for this very reason that in most countries, even in those which are still called Catholic, restraint is put on her whenever she wishes to come forward in public. She must have, of course, the consent of the civil authorities for any demonstration of this kind. The civil authorities are so tender of the health of the people that they are afraid that contagion, pestilence, the cholera morbus, or the plague would be the consequence of such promiscuous gatherings as these. These strange motives the writer himself has seen assigned for shutting up the priests in their churches

on the greatest solemnities, as, for instance, on Corpus Christi day. But the fact is, the modern rulers dislike such displays as these, because they are too sure an index of the real feelings of the people, and the rulers themselves wish to engross all the public attention and respect.

In a human point of view the affection of the people for the Church is almost as remarkable as the love of a great part of mankind for Christ. Those who have read the *Mémoires de Ste. Hélène* know how deeply impressed was Napoleon I. with that strange phenomenon, the *love of Christ*, and the readers of Mr. Lecky's *European Morals* have also, no doubt, admired the eloquent paragraph he penned on the same subject. It may be said that the deep attachment manifested at all times by the common people for the Church of God, partakes of the same character, and could furnish the theme of remarks as eloquent and true.

But look for a moment, dear reader, at the really surprising phase of this tender, affectionate feeling in this very country of ours. Were the Catholics of the United States, the poor among them chiefly, demented in doing what they have joyfully done during so long a period already, not alone for the mere support but for the extension, adornment, and glory of the Church of Christ? No: but they loved their religion as the source of untold blessings; and we see the tokens of that love in the innumerable churches, asylums, hospitals, protectories, houses of education, parochial schools which they have erected. They do not confine their exertions any more to large and populous cities; they dot the whole country with similar establishments, and in the North and East, at least, it is difficult to find a village of a respectable size entirely deprived of these proofs of the warmest attachment. Yet they know that the Church which is the object of so much affection on their part is despised, when it is not hated, by a great part of the surrounding population. They know that by professing openly their deep attachment to Catholicity, they often place obstacles in the way of their success through life. They see the sects around them rich, influential, in possession of sumptuous establishments, and they are aware that a little hypocrisy in pretending conformity to them would secure to them hosts of friends, and occasionally open to them the way to a brilliant life. Are they ever tempted to renounce their mother and hang to the skirts of a more showy woman who invites them to her embrace? They do precisely what the infant, mentioned by St. John Chrysostom, does irresistibly when finding her whose milk he sucked clad poorly, but smiling in the midst of richly attired ladies. The infant does not bestow a look on all this worldly pomp, but runs to the embrace of the only one he loves among them.

Do you wish to have another and certainly a brighter example still of the love of the people for the Church? Go to Ireland. This simple word is sufficient, and it would be vain to enlarge upon it. After centuries of woe better days at last begin to shine over that unfortunate nation. But the change in their worldly prospects does not make any in their feelings. The Church is all for them, and they are only too glad that they can prove it, and bestow upon her all their gifts, without fearing any more the hand of the spoiler.

What Ireland was a hundred years ago Poland is at this moment; and the heroism displayed by the Irish people in previous centuries is the only sign of life the Poles can now give. See the deserts of Siberia filled by thousands of heroes condemned to an ignominious, or, at least, obscure death in the midst of frozen solitudes. Count, if you can, all those who perished before their transportation or on their way to their place of banishment. Picture to yourself, in fine, the agonizing throes of a martyred people. All this they suffer merely because they prefer Catholic unity to schism. All the pretensions of the autocrats of Russia that they are rebels and revolutionists cannot be substantiated, and never could. They had a right to their independence, of which they were unjustly deprived. But at this moment this flimsy pretext has become an open untruth; for the Poles cannot be called political offenders any longer. Their only resistance to-day is in defence of their faith, and they merely suffer and die because they love the Church more than life.

Turn we to Germany at this moment. A spectacle almost as heroic presents itself. Eleven millions of Catholics, deprived gradually of their pastors, look on their churches closed one after another, and are denied the right of educating their children in their faith. The only motive is to place over their heads wolves instead of shepherds, and if they once consented to it favors of every kind would be showered upon them. But they resist determinedly, as the Irish and the Poles did before them; and they show as ardent a love for the Church of Christ as the first Christians ever did under the persecuting scourge of the Roman Emperors. If life is no longer taken away it is rendered unbearable by the taunts and reproaches of the officials of the German government, by their rigid execution of the Falk laws, and by the gloomy prospects to which true religion seems to be doomed.

It is certainly difficult to find in the annals of Catholicity any epoch whatever where a stronger attachment was displayed by the people for the Bride of Christ. Yet we are far from being done. Have we not the heroism of the Swiss peasants and graziers under the lash of a small number of anti-religious fanatics? Can we not with reason expect nearly the same state of affairs in Italy, as soon as its Parliament shall have perfected its means of attack and per-

secution, or when the radicals finally obtain the power which is now within their grasp? Surely when this time arrives the Italian people will prove to the world that they have not degenerated from their deeply Catholic ancestors. The latent faith which all along has been simmering in their hearts will then start up in a blaze, and reveal what is now hidden. Because, forsooth, for more than half a century the innumerable secret societies, which have convulsed the peninsula, counted among their numbers many names belonging to this people, simple souls have imagined that the nation had turned its back on the Church and would never return to her fold. Vain and foolish thought! Those who have entertained it are perfectly and innocently unaware that no nation on earth knows so well how to distinguish between politics and religion. In this they far surpass the French, who for a century have firmly believed that no republican can be a Catholic, and almost no monarchist an infidel. To be enlightened on the subject of Italy in that regard, you have only to enter any Italian church on a day of solemnity. See that crowd of men, of all conditions, but chiefly composed of the lower classes. Many of them have, no doubt, often expressed fiercely their irreconcilable opposition to the government of priests; not a few have belonged, and perhaps belong yet, to some *venta* of Carbonari. Look at them, all on their knees, with their heads bent in adoration at the blessing of the Host. Hear those thousand male voices reverberating through the aisles of the vast edifice. Can this be a sham profession of faith? Is it not a mighty song, coming from the heart as well as from the throat?

The Italian, in fact, especially if he belongs to the people, cannot exist without the Catholic religion. In it he finds the fulfilment of his natural aspirations towards the beautiful, the ideal of art in all its branches. Whatever is noble and grand strikes him; and human respect, that bane of the lower orders in almost all other nations, cannot prevent him from expressing his admiration for anything truly sacred and pious. Let the enemies of the Church in Italy try—not to close the temples of God; the idea would be simply preposterous—but to curtail the religious privileges of the multitude, and to render difficult the solemnity of worship; the voice of the people would soon be heard, and the rash attempt would not be long persevered in. The actual government of Italy is so fully aware of it that it beheld, at least at the beginning, with real dismay, the determination of the Pope not to officiate in St. Peter's. The motive was not, as some pretended, the fear of offending public opinion throughout Europe. It would have been, unfortunately, a baseless fear. It was really the desire of not offending too glaringly the well-known leaning of the multitude.

What we might say in regard to the Spanish people must be dis-

missed with only a word. That it is religiously the same nation which the world has known for many centuries, is proved beyond dispute by the Parliamentary difficulty which still exists, we believe, with regard to granting toleration of worship to the sects separated from the Church. This simple observation is sufficient for the present object; because the difficulty cannot come from the ruling classes in Spain. These mainly have lost their faith, and they would hail with joy the day when all possible sects could, without hindrance, raise their discordant voices and quarrel with each other as well as with the mother Church. But the people in Spain are wise enough not to accept this grant when they do not want it, and when there is not in fact anybody to claim it. The great evil of Spain has been rather of a political than of a religious character; indifference or unbelief is confined to a class of busy-bodies more troublesome than numerous; and it seems that, after all, the great source of agitation originates from the ranks of the army and the navy. The body and soul of the nation belong to the Church, as they did two or three centuries ago.

The picture seems to be complete, with the exception of France; and it looks as if the actual situation of the Church, with regard to the people, had not changed from what it was formerly. Yet it is not entirely so. Immense efforts have been made to estrange the great mass of mankind comprised in the universal name—the people—from the religion of Christ; and these efforts have not been altogether unsuccessful. To what extent the evil has gone, and what hope there is of contracting it into narrower limits, is the main object of this paper. To this we come at last; but what precedes could not possibly be omitted, because of a preconceived notion, altogether false, yet prevalent at this time, and far too mischievous to be left uncontradicted. We mean the idea that faith is in general so far on the wane, that with the exception of a few *Ultramontanes*—this we believe is the word—all orders of society have practically renounced it, and there is no longer any attachment to the Church, unless in the foolish and impressive hearts of a few women and children. Whenever the number of Catholics is quoted at two hundred millions, there is a shrugging of the shoulders, a smile of pity, as at a perfectly preposterous statement, too wild to be believed, except by an idiot. The exclamation even is occasionally heard: "They are all nominal Catholics." We beg your pardon, gentlemen. It is not for the sake of a nominal creed that the Catholics of this country impose on themselves so heavy burdens, and consent to so many pecuniary sacrifices. It is not for a discarded faith that the Irish have so long suffered, and pay so heavily at this moment. It is not for a known sham that the Poles perish of cold in Siberia, that the Germans beard Bismarck and his

laws, the Italians refuse to listen to Protestant propagandism, the Spaniards deny to heresy a right of possession in their soil, etc., etc. No, no, our two hundred millions are not composed of ciphers. We may consent to humor you, gentlemen, to the extent of fifty thousand or so. But as these make a great deal of noise, and are continually fussing and bustling, they are supposed to be much more numerous than they are in fact. And now, having been so generous in allowing them to you for peace's sake, we will add for the sake of truth, that most of them repent of their errors on their death-bed, when they do not belong to the very small knot of *Solidaires* in Belgium or France. The short sketch just outlined in the previous pages was thus absolutely necessary. We come now to the precise object intended from the beginning.

And, as an important preliminary, it must be stated that the subject to be discussed can scarcely be understood by the great bulk of our readers. It supposes the existence of a state of things so different from what is generally witnessed in this country, that sensible people may very well almost refuse to believe. To bring them to a better frame of mind with regard to comprehending so strange a moral phenomenon, we beg of them to remember what they may have themselves witnessed, and what they have certainly often heard, of the fanaticism of former Protestants of the *Blue* kind against the Catholic Church. It is now a subject of wonder; yet every one is sure that such a monstrous misconception and outrageous antagonism really existed for more than two hundred years in this country and in England. The same kind of wonder—or rather a still worse kind—is going to be exhibited in all its naked deformity; and the reader, by remembering this short reference to a former delusion well known to him, will more easily understand the shocking spectacle which must be placed under his wondering gaze in this nineteenth century. But the gradual steps by which the enemies of the Church, or rather of Christianity, led a small part of the people to this climax of absurd hatred against it, ought to be first briefly stated to show how this incredible extreme of folly and bloodthirsty madness was at last reached.

Protestantism had already before endeavored by calumny to turn the people of all European nations against the Church. Our language is plain; some persons may call it heated, or even rough. To suppose Protestantism capable of *calumniating* anybody or anything! Yet it is a fact that all the accusations brought by this widespread heresy against Catholicity were false. There were abuses certainly which demanded correction, and which the Church corrected herself, so that for centuries they have disappeared. Has not Protestantism continued to reproach us with them? Has it not added to them many things which never existed? Do we not

still hear occasionally of great *disclosures*, which a non-Catholic public has learned to laugh at because it knows them to be calumnies? Was it not by Protestants first that the Church was accused of extortion, of cruelty to the people, of deserving its execration, etc. This is now a part of history, and it can be referred to without subjecting the writer to the imputation of hot-headed abuse or rough and uncouth language.

But it must be said that the philosophers of the last century in France and the open or concealed enemies of the Church in this age have far outstripped Protestantism in this regard. They have, in this age, assumed a brilliant name, which too often turns to be a misnomer. They call themselves Liberals, and their programme is supposed to be that of *liberal doctrines*. We must first discuss this Liberalism, because, under the pretext of it, the Church has been wrongfully accused before the people. These Liberals generally preface the books they write on the subject by long dissertations on the gloomy times which preceded this enlightened era. There they find many occasions for abusing the Church and accusing her particularly of being the enemy of the people. A model in this kind of literature is a big quarto volume published in our day by the editors of the compilation known as the *Moniteur Universel*—the official daily paper during the French Revolution. As no publication of the size of the *Moniteur*—twenty enormous folio volumes—has ever contained so many horrors coolly detailed day by day during this memorable epoch, chiefly during the Terror—it is supposed that the modern editors wished to smooth down this frightful recital of revolutionary madness by piling up horrors of another kind in the previous period of time. De Tocqueville in his book *l'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, shows that he had been bewildered by the first volume of the modern *Moniteur*, so as to adopt many of its statements. Recently Mr. Taine has written a powerful work on the same subject, starting from the same data, and reaching the same conclusions. All those contributions to historical knowledge impress the reader with the conviction that until 1789 France had groaned under the most wretched despotism, dating from the middle ages, weighing particularly upon the poor, and that the people were reduced to the most abject slavery. The Church, of course, was mainly instrumental in bringing about this frightful result, and the first thing to be done was to wipe out the Church. To do this, the people must first be weaned from her; for, strange to say, the nation was still in 1789 ardently attached to her in the greatest part of France, and an immense effort was required to alter its sentiments in this regard. Nothing was thought to be more sure of success than the heralding of the new *Liberal doctrines*, in which the people would find a guiding light, and would acknowl-

edge in the promoters of the new enterprise their only true friends and protectors in their forlorn state.

This is not the place to discuss the truth or falsehood of the recent accusations against the then ecclesiastical rulers of France. Even if they were true, they would not affect exactly the Catholic Church, which, we believe, spreads farther than the limits of France. There were, no doubt, many abuses among the French clergy before the Revolution. Still, that it was not the upholder of despotism is evident enough from the whole annals of the French Church from beginning to end. At any rate the Revolution has not, that we know, rendered the lot of the French people much more tolerable than it then was; and the rapid succession of revolution after revolution in that unhappy country is a sure proof that happiness has not flowed naturally from Liberal doctrines.

But it is with these Liberal doctrines that we must be chiefly concerned at this moment, and the discussion of the subject may open the eyes of many who, trusting to a fine name, are easily satisfied that they contain an unquestionable boon.

The modern Liberal ideas are certainly, with regard to religious, social, and political principles, exactly the contrary of those of the middle ages. For this reason, probably, the modern Liberals are fiercely opposed to the spirit of those "dark" times; and they pretend to be the ardent friends of the people by fighting against the return of the despotism, rudeness, idiotic credulity then prevalent. It is the Church, they say, which yet upholds mediæval ideas; it is against the Church, consequently, that the people ought to rise as against their secular enemy. On this theme they have been harping for the last hundred years in France; and, unfortunately, a part of the people has listened to these fierce accusations, and is at this moment decidedly hostile to the Church in many parts of the country. These open denunciations have even reached countries far distant from France. M. de Bismarck also has declared in a celebrated speech that he is fighting only against mediævalism, and that the secular party, of which he is the champion on the side of the Germans, must this time conquer and crush its clerical antagonist. The great chancellor is, therefore, by his own declaration, on the *side* of the people; but the Catholic people of Germany do not seem to have much faith in this declaration.

It is evident that in this fierce contest there is misrepresentation somewhere; and the question must be clearly elucidated, to be decided correctly. No question, perhaps, at this time, is more important than this one; because it is evident that the principles which ruled society during the mediæval epoch were totally at variance with those generally upheld by modern Liberalism; and, as there is undoubtedly an ugly side, not in the mediæval principles—

mark it well—but in many features of society at that time, the *principles* are never spoken of, and the *features* being constantly thrust forward, the Church is accused of being the cause of these, and is condemned, although nothing of the kind can justly be imputed to her, as will be proved.

These ugly features—the principles will be discussed further on—were derived from two sources: the want of physical knowledge and feudalism. This last was by far the worst of the two. By the primary and essential law of the system, to the possession of land alone was attached the enjoyment of any rights, political or civil. And, as the possession of land belonged then to the successful invaders of any country, among whom it was invariably divided, it followed that only plunderers had political and civil rights, at least originally. Dudo, of St. Quentin, has told us in his barbarous poem how the whole of Normandy, without the exception of a hamlet, was thus wholly distributed among the hungry crews of Scandinavians whom he admired for their boldness and ferocity. Thus was laid the foundation of feudalism by rough tribes, pagan at the time, and not acknowledging any other law but that of *might*. When the fury of the barbarian invasions had cooled down, the same original customs naturally continued to prevail, and the fortunate landowner alone could enjoy rights of any kind. The remainder of the population was composed of *villeins*, for whom there could not be any rights whatever, not even that of an action at law. This prevalence of *might* continued for a long period, and was the source of incessant wars. What share had the Church in the establishment of such an abominable social state? Can any of her enemies accuse her of having suggested or shared in this barbarous scheme? No doubt many bishops, in course of time, became at once both church dignitaries and feudal lords. But no one has yet pretended that such guilty abuses were in any way countenanced by the Christian principles always taught and advocated by the Church of Christ. This was the chief bane of the mediæval period; and if the times were dark it was mainly owing to a social system imposed on Europe by the barbarian fury coming from the pagan North, which lasted from the fifth to the tenth century.

But is it not true that the Church has often appeared as the friend of despotism against liberty? In these modern times has she not often sided with the absolute rulers against the people? This seems to be more plausible, but does not go further than plausibility, as a few words will suffice to prove.

That absolute power in these modern times did not originate with the Church, must be admitted now by all students of history. In the middle ages the right principles of government were acknowledged theoretically, and abstractedly from the outbreaks of

feudal might. They had been thus settled by the Church herself. She had been mainly instrumental in establishing the municipal and political liberties which preceded everywhere in Europe the era of absolute power. The mediæval epoch, in fact, is remarkable for the liberal charters granted to all cities, and for the yearly parliaments, or States General, which form so universal a feature of the period. Absolute power in Europe originated, in fact, from Protestantism. It was fostered by the first leaders of that great heresy, who did not imagine they could succeed without enlisting the favor of the secular princes; and in this opinion they were right. These leaders of heresy, therefore, declared that the political rulers were supreme in Church and State. This is well known now, as well as the origin of the theory of the divine right of kings, which gradually passed from England to France, owing to the adoption of the Gallican doctrine, so called, which was forced on the clergy by Louis XIV. Macaulay can be read with profit on the subject in his *History of England* (vol. i.). Thus the false accusations made against the Church are really true charges against her adversaries.

After a period of absolute power, in which the Church had no share whatever, and from which she was the first to suffer, came, as was natural, a popular reaction against its excesses, from which sprung the political revolutionary spirit so conspicuous in our days. Had the new theorists merely aimed at bringing back the former liberties of the people and re-establishing the old freedom, without disturbing permanently public order, there is no doubt in our mind that the Church would have blessed the attempt, and advised the kings to consent to necessary reforms. But all men acquainted with contemporaneous history know that unfortunately this was not at all the case. The new advocates of freedom went directly to such an excess of *reformation* that they proposed first to destroy everything, without knowing exactly what system of government they would finally adopt. All thoughtful writers on political questions have remarked the radical and portentous change which took place in the mind of Europeans generally at the end of the last century, and brought on the period of fluctuation in governments, such as nearly all nations in Europe have experienced during the last hundred years. Then, indeed, began the struggle between "the kings and the peoples." No sane man can admit that, in this terrible contest, the kings were always wrong and the peoples always right. In general the popular fury went immediately beyond all the bounds, not alone of propriety, but of decency, honor, and justice. Thus the Church could not side with the "revolutionists," and on this account she has been accused of being the enemy of freedom. For this we admire her, and we think her firmness came from the Holy Spirit who guides her. The rulers

of a mere worldly institution might have been tempted to place themselves at the head of the "people," as Pius IX. was urged to do by the Italians in 1848. There was no danger that the head of the Church could be guilty of such a folly.

The second ugly feature which has been mentioned in regard to the mediæval period was the want of physical knowledge then prevalent, which was certainly the source of much rudeness, discomfort, disease, and a thousand inconveniences of every sort; and this is coolly brought against the Church as if she had been the cause of it. We would not consent to lower ourselves so far as to discuss such a point as this, if it did not furnish us the occasion of reflections not altogether unimportant. The objection against the Church is commonly placed before the eyes of the people in this wise: "The modern world is certainly far ahead of mediæval times in point of comfort, knowledge, wealth, and mild manners. All our actual superiority in this respect is due to 'modern thought or science.' The Church, therefore, in opposing this, sets herself in antagonism to our actual superiority, which she would destroy if she could." The ignorant or unreflecting multitude admires the argument, and execrates the Church, supposing that, if she could, she would oblige us to travel on foot instead of using steamboats and railroads. The writer remembers to have heard this said in his presence by a learned member of a scientific body in Florence.

The answer is plain and decisive: Material comfort in mediæval times was, undoubtedly, far less general than it is in our day. The natural progress of physical and chemical science; the knowledge of natural laws; the extraordinary extension of commerce; the diffusion of wealth, have brought a far greater degree of material well-being. But these things the Church has never anathematized, no more than science itself. "Modern thought" or "science" to which the *Syllabus* is opposed, is nothing of this kind. All our superiority in this regard over our ancestors is the certain result of the progress of knowledge, to which Christian men have contributed at least as much as others. It is not in the least due to the spread of Liberal ideas, but to the study of the physical world. We are more enlightened in this respect than the mediæval people, merely because we happened to be born five or six hundred years after them. The barbarians, their near ancestors, knew absolutely nothing of physics; and the monks of the "Dark Ages" had to begin the study themselves. A certain friar, by the name of Bacon, was not, after all, a very mean adept in physical and chemical sciences; and an Irish bishop, of the ninth century, by the name of Virgil, was not a very unsuccessful student of astronomy, although he had not the aid of any telescope or *lunette*.

Pope Pius IX. has never denied in the *Syllabus* that Christians

can lawfully enjoy the comfort consequent on a greater knowledge of natural laws. We would like to see a full list of the men devotedly attached to Catholicity, who have contributed to the well-being of ordinary people by discoveries of this kind. It would be a very long one. As for the multitude of excellent Catholics who do not scruple to profit by those useful inventions, who could count it? Who would pretend that commerce has been extended to its actual limits, which now embrace the whole world, by men altogether devoid of faith? Has ever the Church discountenanced the progress of geographical discovery? Have not many of her missionaries been themselves geographical explorers and discoverers?

All this is certainly ridiculous and stupid. But the opponents of mediævalism are so furious in their attacks on that period that we must go on a little longer in the same vein.

One of the most prominent features of the middle ages was monachism, and it is universally known how this institution has been ridiculed and assailed. Many men yet think that the monks in general were ignorant, were afraid of the wiles of Satan, if they strove to dive in the mysteries of nature, and were consequently opposed to "science," or even unable to understand the meaning of the word, wallowing in filth in their wretched cells, given up to superstition and unmanly fears, unfit entirely to guide the people who looked up to them with awe and veneration. Except a few bolder spirits among them, like Friar Bacon, to whom honor is paid with a kind of condescending respect, the rest of them are considered to have been absolutely worthy of contempt, and the greatest obstacle to improvement; so that they were justly removed out of the way as soon as science appeared.

Pity that we cannot expatiate on such a theme, and show to such appreciators of worth that they "blaspheme what they do not know." But a word only may suffice. Any one who has studied the subject in the proper sources, any one who has, for instance, gone through the abundant monastic matter contained in the great collection of Migne, is satisfied that the notions mentioned in the previous paragraph are sheer nonsense. The magnificent establishments with which the monks had covered Europe have been ever since the great models for architects when they wished to construct princely mansions, palaces of art, scientific institutions of any kind. If the cell of a monk was not large it was not *filthy*. Filth in fact was left by them to the future constructors of "tenement houses." The life of the monk was divided into two nearly equal parts, one devoted to the worship of God in their splendid churches, the other entirely given to study or agriculture. Examine the ruins that remain of the great monastic centres in Italy, Germany, Spain, France, England, Ireland, etc.; look into the material details of

those gigantic structures, and say if there was need of removing them when science arrived; say if in the modern establishments that have replaced them, such as barracks, prisons, factories, and the like, the comfort of men is better consulted than it was in the much-abused monasteries. The monks, in fact, have been the introducers of comfort in Europe; they have given the first example of it, for the barbarians before them cared more for plunder than for comfort.

Who will believe that if the numerous appliances for an easy life had been discovered in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries—as many were undoubtedly introduced at that time—the monks and churchmen of the period would have spurned them as inventions and wiles of Satan? Yet such is in reality the idea many people of our age have formed to themselves of the old Christian times. They actually imagine that men were not then men in flesh and blood, but fanatical devotees like Hindoo ascetics or Mohammedan fakirs.

But the upholders of “modern times” and “modern science” will insist that comfort and an easy life were positively in antagonism with the very idea of Christianity as understood by the monks. Had they not professed to follow a life of austerities, fasts, and vigils, the scourging of the body, the most extreme mortification, and penance? Was not, in their notion, the road of comfort the highway to hell, etc., etc.? The answer is easy and requires only a sentence or two. That Christianity does not invite us to a life of pleasure, but plainly teaches us to subdue our senses, and strive for heaven while on earth, is not a monkish doctrine only, but that of Christ. Christ in His Divine person gave us the example of it. The subject is too holy to be treated lightly, and would require development which time and space forbid us. A single remark must suffice. A man may be an austere Christian and still devote his life to science, far from anathematizing it. Comfort does not necessarily lead to hell, and can be indulged in by ordinary Christians, provided the commandments of God are kept. The mediaeval monks understood this well. With this reflection the subject must be dismissed.

A word must be added on the subject of the Papacy and the Church in general, in relation to science and modern improvements. It is passing strange indeed that people should persevere in accusing the Church of an antagonism which not only has never existed but is directly and emphatically contradicted by all the facts of the case. The reader is referred to a previous paper, where it is absolutely proved that there has never been on earth an intellectual body comparable to the Catholic Church.¹ There is the unan-

¹ The Church and the Intellectual World, Amer. Cath. Quar. Review, July, 1876.

swerable reply to the taunts of modern scientists. Should they pretend that this opposition to science regards only the present time and the physical sciences studied in our days, we would merely, in answer, copy a passage of the *Unità Cattolica* of Rome, a translation of which has been published by the *Catholic Review* of Brooklyn:

“If the Papacy had been afraid of science it would not have had in Rome the first university in Europe, and such a number of scientific establishments and academies, as to make it the very city of studies. What have you found in the monasteries of Rome which you ransacked? The richest of libraries; so rich that you had not men enough to convey away the treasures they contained; but had to make donkeys of your soldiers to drag away on carts the books of those *ignorant* monks. Your Victor Emmanuel Library ‘of the first class,’ contains 300,000 volumes taken from these same ignorant monks; and of those taken from the Jesuits the greater part were books on experimental sciences! If the Papacy had been afraid of science we would not have had in Secchi the most learned astronomer of the age; we would not have had in Pianciani and Stoppiani profound geologists; nor would we have had the long series of naturalists who to-day are found among the most courageous defenders of Catholicism.”

Thus we have gone through the *ugly* features of mediævalism, and it is now in order to speak of its principles as opposed radically to the Liberal doctrines of our days. It is by the proclamation of these doctrines that a part of the “people” in Europe has been not only estranged from the Church, but set in fierce opposition to her. This must, therefore, attract all our attention.

A contributor to the *Month of London*, in its number for June of this year, states exactly the difference between the mediæval and the Liberal ideas:

“The difference between the civilization of this age and the Christian civilization of the mediæval period is radical. Their essential ideas are diametrically opposed. The one was based on self-sacrifice, the other rests upon selfishness. In the one the unseen world counted for everything, in the other it counts for nothing. The one derived its motives and its principles from the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the other derives them from the teachings of political economy. The place which is filled in the one by God and man’s duties, is occupied in the other by man and man’s rights. This is the difference, I think, between this age of the world and the first period of modern civilization.”

This short sketch is sufficiently clear, but it requires some development to be perfectly understood.

The word “civilization,” in this passage, is taken in the sense of moral and religious culture, not in that of material well-being only; and in this sense it is absolutely true that mediæval civilization was far superior to our own. But to give a more thorough and clear understanding of this we will exclude the term “civilization,” and use that of *ideas*. Thus we say, and we shall prove, that mediæval ideas were far preferable to Liberal ideas. This last expression is commonly but very erroneously taken, in the opinion of most men of our age, to be conterminous with that of culture. Nearly

everybody says that any one who opposes liberal ideas opposes civilization, culture, the well-being of the people, etc. On this account the Church is set down as the great enemy of progress and of the people. Let us analyze, therefore, what is contained in the expression *Liberal ideas*, and we may form an opinion very different from the current one. Donoso Cortes had already published some admirable reflections on the subject in his golden little book entitled *Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. But unfortunately the evident haste with which it was published, prevented him from expressing his strong and often profound views with sufficient clearness. Lucidity, it is known, is invariably the result of patient labor only.

The best way, after all, is to contrast the ideas of mediæval times with the Liberal ideas of our age on whatever regards political, social, and moral questions, and it will not be hard to decide on which side superiority rests. A somewhat lengthy discussion is necessary here because it is really from misrepresentation and misconception of the subject that the popular fury in some countries has, in fact, been excited against the Church.

I. What principles were upheld on government by the great masters of the middle ages? They were altogether those of the Christian Scriptures; and the long line of the rulers of the Church, beginning with St. Paul, had explained the subject thoroughly, *Omnis potestas a Deo est*. This was the cardinal principle on which everything, even in civil and political affairs, turned. Man, even the highest monarch, could not command man, unless he had received the power from above. This was not the Divine right of Kings as understood and explained by James I. of England; far from it. But this axiom contains a great truth on which depends all our dignity as men. The real elevation of any human being is such that God alone can claim his obedience. If, therefore, he is bound to submit to the orders of a king, or of any civil governor, a military chieftain, a superior in fine of any kind, let him be prelate in the Church or man in authority in the State, it is God only that he obeys, because all power comes originally from God. Its immediate source may be hereditary right, or constitutional enactment, or popular election, or a combination of these; but the real investiture of authority is given by God himself, who is the only true source of authority on earth. This undoubtedly raises the claim of obedience to a high degree, but it is merely the obedience of a rational being to a mandate of God; and, instead of lowering man, it supposes in him so high a dignity that heaven alone can impose on him such a duty as that of obedience. And this is true in every Christian commonwealth, be it the most democratic republic, or the most absolute monarchy.

This idea of authority belongs exclusively to the Christian religion. In the former Pagan republics or empires, it was absolutely unknown except in the most ancient times. Homer tells us that it is Jove who gives to the kings the power of ruling. But much later on, if there was a faint remembrance of the principle, it was merely a shadow, and in point of fact *might* ruled and nothing else. But St. Paul told the Christians of his time that "they must obey the prince for *conscience sake*," and this became a universal principle in Christian states. Public opinion in Europe continued to be ruled by this weighty axiom until the modern Liberal ideas, as shall soon be proved, completely altered it, or rather abolished it.

Does such a principle of government as this consecrate despotism? Certainly not, since it can agree with the most popular régimes. In point of fact, a most extraordinary degree of liberty prevailed in Europe all through the middle ages. This was the time when innumerable franchises, corporate, municipal, or provincial, flourished everywhere, and were, for all, the sure guarantees of personal immunity from injustice. The lower orders of society had their guilds or associations, whose privileges the highest in the land dared not infringe upon. There were, no doubt, occasional collisions between those various corporations and the feudal dignitaries; but these collisions were proofs of an active life, and of a true liberty based on acknowledged rights. It is not, of course, pretended that the system was perfect. There were many and great abuses. But these resulted from the inherent defect of human nature.

Beside all this, if the power of the rulers was then great because they were the "representatives of God," this power was not only limited by the numerous privileges just alluded to; it was also far from being irresponsible; and this irresponsibility is the only sure mark of despotism. Every master in any degree was responsible to a superior, and abuses of any kind could be repressed by a higher authority. The very hierarchy of feudalism—although what the writer thinks of the system is well known—was in fact, a well-settled scale of power over power to which the weak could appeal in case of oppression. The highest monarchs even had to acknowledge the authority of the Popes as being above theirs, and yet what was the most exalted consecration of true freedom (which consists in the sacredness of all rights, and the security from all injustices), has been artfully misrepresented as the most cunningly devised engine of despotism on the part of the Church.

The voice of the middle ages was most emphatic on one point in politics, namely, that the great object of political power was the good of the people; and this was likewise an axiom publicly and

authoritatively proclaimed by the Christian religion. According to the very text of those times the rulers were bound in conscience "to do all in their power for the increase of God's kingdom, and the training of man for his supernatural destiny."

We must rest satisfied with this fundamental doctrine of mediæval Europe on politics. We must pass on to the consideration of our second point: What were the social principles then prevalent?

II. They were those of the Decalogue as explained in the Gospel and by the Church. These were considered as principles of law which were to govern the people in their relations with the state, with each other, and in their families. It ought not to be supposed, however, that these were understood precisely as they were once in New England, and that the civil enactments in mediæval times were of the same nature as the *Blue Laws* of Connecticut. We would not abuse unduly the old Puritans. They knew, at least, how to maintain morality in their American States; and if they were harsh in their legislation, they formed, at least, a strong and energetic people a hundred years ago, at the Declaration of Independence. This, indeed, is not small praise.

But it is not to be denied that they were no more infallible in the framing of their laws than in their interpretation of Scripture. They themselves rejected the claim of infallibility in any shape. They followed, therefore, merely the bent of their nature in the institutions, legal, moral, and civil, which they established; and their nature was stern, uncompromising, and exclusive. The general leaning of the Catholic Church has never been in the same direction. Those who do not admit her claim to infallibility in faith and morals, must, nevertheless, grant that the institutions she everywhere fostered were always more genial, and better accommodated to the natural weakness of human nature, without, however, compromising in any degree the great principles of Christian morality, which she always sustained at whatever cost.

And throughout the middle ages her claims in this regard were fully admitted. Man was a being destined to immortality. His actions on earth would find, hereafter, their due rewards or punishments. Purity of life was sure of the first, vice of the second. His relations with his superiors, his equals, his inferiors, always regulated by religion, imposed on him duties which his eternal interests required he should attend to. Was not this a grand basis for society? Can the reason of man frame a better one? This has been attempted by Liberalism: we shall soon see with what success.

But it is chiefly the domestic view of the system which ought to attract our attention for the moment. The domestic hearth of the Christian throughout the middle ages was understood to have

a sublime pattern and model in the *House of Nazareth*. There is no denying this. Read any of the chronicles of those times, and say if this is not perfectly true. Did not people then often think of Jesus, and Mary, and Joseph, as portrayed in a few lines of the Gospel? It cannot be denied that their chief attention was given to religion which engrossed most of their thoughts, and thus consequently in their houses, in the feudal castles as well as in the cottages of the poor, the *House of Nazareth* was continually before their eyes. They were so often and so fully occupied with this holy thought, that the very walls of that cottage were said and firmly believed to have been transported, for their benefit, first to Dalmatia, then to Italy. As soon as Palestine was given over to the uncontrolled power of the Moslem, and the Christians could not, except with the greatest difficulty, go and shed tears of joy in the very place where Jesus had dwelt so long with His mother and reputed father, the House itself was carried by angels through the air over all Asia Minor and Greece, to rest finally on the Italian shores of the Adriatic. Call this only a legend, if you choose; it tells, at least, what was uppermost in the minds of our ancestors. They did not invent such a legend as this either for the grotto of Bethlehem, or even for the Holy Sepulchre for which so many thousands of them gave their lives. The legend, if you will so call it, concerned exclusively the house of the Holy Family, to consecrate by its daily sight, the ruling idea they were to form of their own family. Thus the great type of the *family*, so important in the social life of man, was considered of paramount importance by those ancestors of ours whom so many think of as entirely rude, uncouth, almost barbarous. Look at the great ideas contained in this single one! Jesus, the model of Christian children and young men; Mary, the model of all women; Joseph, the pattern of all men, chiefly of the artisan and laborer. Was not this, we repeat again, a deep and solid basis for society? Can any one invent a better one?

Finally, the moral aspect of the middle ages ought to be examined for a single instant. Morality was certainly concerned in the previous considerations on politics and society, but it is the proper attribute of man as man. He is the only moral being on earth. This was the great principle of mediævalism, that man was to regulate absolutely his conduct by the precepts of the Gospel. Then he was not told, "money is power," and "time is money," and "honesty is the best policy," and "go ahead, honestly if you can; at any rate go ahead." These pagan axioms and others of the same kind, were not his only moral code. He would have shuddered at the very idea of regulating his life from them. He knew too well the value of his soul, and the certainty of a here-

after, to adopt them as his governing principles. His morality was of another sort, and was based on the idea of a conscience ruled by eternal and heavenly principles, to which he had often to sacrifice his worldly interests. Conscience! We will soon consider what Liberalism has made of it; but for the mediæval man it was a Divine voice, speaking constantly in his inmost soul, which he was bound to follow and obey under pain of offending and disobeying God! This voice he had to consult in all his actions through life; to obey implicitly when it spoke plainly; to consult others wiser than himself when the utterance was not distinct enough. Whenever he failed in these great duties he was bound to acknowledge he had done wrong; to repair it if possible; to bewail it at any rate; to consider it as disobedience to God, and humbly beg the pardon of his heavenly Father. What has Liberalism done with these saving principles which have preserved the edifice of society during so many ages? For it is not to be denied that although they regulate the conduct of *individuals* only, still they are the safeguard of the whole social body.

The subjective certainty, therefore, of having a conscience; the objective responsibility of it before God; the judgment-seat at the end of life as a great sanction of the whole: these were the bases of mediæval morality. Who will refuse to acknowledge that when man has reached such a point, he is civilized, thoroughly civilized?

But this subject cannot be discussed any longer, owing to the limits imposed on us. The Liberal ideas have now to be briefly studied, and confronted with the previous ones.

Liberalism is a very vague term. On the threshold of this investigation it must be analyzed thoroughly. Were it confined to what it meant first, a political system embracing rights for all, constitutional guarantees, sacredness of individual, corporate, or provincial privileges, etc., there would be no real antagonism between Liberal and mediæval ideas. For, in spite of the misconception of many men on the subject, it is a solemn fact that in the mediæval period power was not absolute; man had rights as well as corporations and federative provinces; law and custom consecrated many liberties, as well as religion; and in fine men were not slaves, but free agents. The exception taken against feudal abuses cannot here have any bearing, for reasons adduced in a previous paragraph. The consequence is that Mediævalism was in truth Liberalism understood in the proper sense.

But it is unfortunately true that the word Liberalism has been retained to express a system altogether *illiberal*, which goes now also under the various names of "modern thought," "modern culture," etc. An effort ought to be made to understand what all this means exactly. For the subject is at best obscure, and not yet suf-

ficiently explained, although it inflames millions of men with a sort of enthusiasm, and goads to a real madness, as we shall see, a considerable part of the *people* in several European states. To be just to the adverse party, we will take their own expressions, and use their solemn declarations. It would not be fair to judge them from the notions some of their adversaries entertain of them. For, there is a party opposed to Liberalism of any sort; but we do not belong to it. In fact a Catholic cannot belong to it in these United States, where the whole liberty of the Church reposes, in great part, upon genuine liberal ideas. These are not to be confounded with modern Liberalism, but rather belong to those mediæval political and social doctrines, referred to a few paragraphs back. Undoubtedly, many men misconceive in this country the right notions on the subject; but it can be maintained that the liberty the Church enjoys, comes in great part from the original freedom shared in by all Christians during the mediæval period. The elements of it remained in England when they disappeared in other European countries, and from England passed over to America.

Let us hear, therefore, what the upholders of modern Liberalism say of their own tenets, setting aside whatever is asserted against them by the pure and absolute monarchists of France, Spain, and other European countries. The reader will then clearly understand why Pius IX. has condemned modern Liberalism in his *Syllabus*. The subject must be considered under the three heads of political, social, and moral principles, as was done for the adverse doctrine.

I. First, it is undoubtedly a political axiom with them that society in modern times ought to be governed independently of religion. And the meaning of this is not, that in countries where many sects exist together with the Catholic Church, none having the predominance, maxims of toleration ought to be prudently followed, when otherwise great evils would be the consequence. They go much farther, and they openly pretend that society has now reached such a high point of perfection that religion has no bearing on it. It can very well prosper, they say, independently of a publicly acknowledged religion. Religion bears only on the individual, should he feel inclined to it; and the individual may draw great benefits from it, but he must be allowed to follow his free choice. On this account they deny *in toto* that "power comes from God." What need is there of it since religious principles of any kind have no bearing whatever on government, politics, society? Power, they insist, comes from the will of the majority. There is nothing divine, consequently, in human governments, neither in their origin nor in their action. Man has to bow to the will of the greater number; and in obeying the just laws of his country, he does not obey God, who

has nothing to do with human governments and with law. It is in this sense that politics are altogether removed from the domain of religion, contrary to the great fundamental axiom of mediæval times. Which of the two is the better? The choice certainly is not hard to make, at least for those who admit that God has something to do with human affairs, and that law is based on eternal principles; that is, for all sensible people.

There is no need of remarking that this political principle of Liberalism renders conscience in man perfectly useless, a complete dead weight, at least in politics. When the majority decides a question, it is altogether independently of conscience, over which no human power in itself can have any control. You have to follow the decision, because it is that of the majority, and for no other reason. To-morrow the decision might be reversed, and the change of conduct then imposed upon you could not likewise have any bearing on morality. In this case it is only the force of the majority that can compel you. When the principle, "politics must be independent of religion," is put forward, this must be the necessary consequence. The whole must be called by its proper name: it is simply political atheism.

It follows, also, strictly from this that religion being completely removed from the field of politics, the Church can have no function to fulfil in the State; and this is universally admitted, wherever modern Liberalism holds sway, as an axiom never to be infringed upon. Cavour proclaimed: "A free Church in a free State;" but it was at best a deception. As he died before the maxim was fully admitted in Italy, no one can know what he really meant; for the proposition is susceptible of several meanings. The obvious one would be that in a free State the Church must be free; but this is merely a truism, and it is not the meaning intended by Liberalism. For if it were, then, in order that the Church might be free, no restraint could be placed on her action with respect to her spiritual children, and her decisions would never be interfered with by the State. In all European countries the courts would then declare themselves incompetent to interfere, as they frequently do in the United States, when some clergyman or a layman rebellious against her discipline, applies to the lay tribunals for redress. But this is what European nations will never understand. The great number of Liberals in Europe attribute, in fact, to the motto of Cavour only the absurd sense that the State is perfectly indifferent to the Church, and only on this account leaves her free to do what she chooses, as long as nobody complains of her. For Liberalism cannot attach any other meaning to the maxim, since its great principle on the subject is that politics are altogether independent of religion, and have not any respect to show to her.

And in general this supreme mockery, such as it has just been shown to be, lasts but a moment; for, another maxim, to which Liberalism tends everywhere, is that the State is supreme, and controls the Church. How can the Church be free under the operation of this latter maxim, which is more and more reduced to act, everywhere? Consequently, you do not hear any longer in Italy the celebrated axiom of Cavour: "A free Church in a free State;" but you begin already to hear a very different one, namely: "The Church subordinate to the State." Is not this the meaning of the law lately enacted in Italy by Parliament, that clergymen shall be subjected to *conscription*? When a solemn principle of the Church, which absolutely forbids her ministers to bear arms, is so openly declared null and void by the Legislature, who will dare to speak again of a "free Church in a free State?"

In adopting these maxims of government, the pretended Liberal States of Europe deprive themselves of the help which the Church could furnish for the moralization of the people; a very serious consideration for all true statesmen. The spiritual power, humbled by the lay element, considered by the State as unworthy of any trust, and subjected only to the suspicions and the spy system of the police, or the animadversion of the courts of justice imbued with the same maxims, is thus purposely offered to the people as a contemptible anomaly in the social order. What respect can the rulers of the Church expect from the classes of society which are generally deeply impressed by exterior appearances, and which judge of worth only by the show of visible deference rendered by the public? The State cannot, in this case, rely on the means of moral improvement left to the Church with regard to the mass of the nation. But what do they care? They have come to the point of desiring the disappearance of that detested spiritual authority; and the sooner the people renounce their allegiance to it, the better for their own supreme control.

It is not thus that statesmen, and often even mere politicians, regard the Christian ministry in the United States. The maxim of Cavour was adopted here long before Cavour uttered it, but they understood it in the obvious sense referred to above. They are very careful to recognize the spiritual authority in all that relates to Church discipline, and thus to leave her free; and any case brought before the courts of law where that discipline simply is involved, draws directly from the judges a decree of incompetency, and the whole subject is sent back to the decision of the proper tribunal, that is, of the Church herself. Everything likewise which conduces to the honor of the clerical element is done by the State to preserve among the people respect for it. Thus churches, schools, charitable establishments, under the exclusive control of the clergy, are ex-

empted from taxes. The decorum of public worship is strictly secured by the police, if need be, etc., etc. There is, unfortunately, at this moment some disturbance of this friendly feeling; but it has been mainly caused by what is going on in Europe; and it is to be hoped that the former harmony will soon be restored.

To return to European liberalism, it is not surprising that the declaration of the supremacy of the State over the Church should usher in encroachments of a similar character upon many other points, besides that of the spiritual authority. At this moment these "encroachments" extend to nearly all the departments of human activity in municipal life, corporate action, social and intellectual culture. They unblushingly establish an open "monopoly" for the State in the government of cities, in dictating laws to all corporations, regulating social customs, and chiefly, in taking possession of the human intellect by State education.

Is not this what is understood in our days by "Modern Liberalism?" At least it is thus understood by nearly all statesmen of Europe. We take the liberty of coolly calling it the most monstrous *despotism* that could be devised. At least it will become so when carried to its last consequences, which it has not yet reached. A contributor to the London *Month*, of June last, Mr. Lilly, has justly remarked on the subject:

"Neither has the change in the basis of governments been favorable to their stability, nor has the contraction of their sphere tended to the advancement of liberty. The contemporary history of countries where the new ideas have had free course . . . supplies only too abundant evidence of the truth of this assertion. Revolution succeeds revolution on the continent; but the effect of each change is ever an increased centralization of authority."

In conclusion we may be allowed to ask: What has been gained for the welfare of mankind in the passage from mediæval to modern ideas? This question would become still more interesting by demonstrating to the reader that from Liberalism has sprung Socialism, which now looms up ready to destroy all existing institutions, and replace them by its wild fancies. But this portentous subject may be treated of more satisfactorily on a future occasion.

II. Passing now from the political to the social theories of Liberalism, and contrasting them with those of the mediæval period, the task becomes comparatively easy, because the modern ideas on the subject are at this time profusely developed, explained, and eulogized, in the innumerable books written on the supposed science, called *Sociology*. Political economy has preceded it, and is yet included in it. Innumerable volumes have likewise been published on this last subject. The words which recur oftenest in those elaborate productions are these: *Capital, Labor, Sources of Wealth, Check on the Increase of Population, Fight for Existence, Supply*

and Demand, Wages of Labor, etc., etc. The authors evidently imagine that the best thing that can be made of this beautiful earth is to turn it into a huge, gigantic, grinding and crushing, iron or cotton mill; or into a systematic, co-operative, and mathematically-arranged farm, with all modern improvements, including the suppression of Sundays and Holy days. It will be the supreme reign of machinery. Man himself will have to go at the speed of a locomotive; as well as the government, the camp, the police, the municipal institutions, and the Church, if any is left. All this, including rewards and punishments, which receive quite other names in the new system, is pompously called *Sociology*; and there will be no other human society acknowledged by "modern thought," except the complexity of relations suggested by the present paragraph.

Of all the elements of social life which, anterior to the present time, were considered as sacred and imperishable, the sentiment of the submission of the subject to the State for God's sake, the preservation of all rights inherent in the social hierarchy, the feelings of Christian charity for all, etc., etc., one only is by chance preserved in the new system, and the same name is used still, except by the most advanced Sociologist, namely, the Socialists. The word *family* is not yet expunged from the vocabulary of many of those gentlemen. But how different from the family originated by Christianity! The sacrament of marriage being unrecognized, and a kind of civil tie being adopted in its place, what becomes of woman? She is, alas! destined to become again the slave she was in former Pagan times. What becomes of the children? First, their number must be reduced to the lowest point. A powerful check must be imposed on the "increase of population." Secondly, the children are useful only in multiplying mechanical power on earth. For, everything is resolvable into mechanical power. Thirdly, their education does not belong to the father and mother, but to the State; and thus, in fact, the family is abolished.

Let the reader be well convinced that there is no exaggeration whatever in these remarks. A fuller development would make them even still more striking. But what a frightful degradation! How different is the picture here offered from the one we have seen in mediæval times impressed constantly on the imagination of all,—the House of Nazareth! And it is in favor of such *Liberal* ideas as these that the people have been lashed to fury against the Church, as will presently be seen.

III. But we must hasten on, as a word, at least, has to be said of the moral aspect of the individual in the new Liberal ideas. The principle is boldly and unflinchingly laid down that the morality of man must be independent: independent, namely, of God and religion. But an independent morality in such sense as this must

necessarily resolve itself into *utilitarianism*. Mr. Lecky, in his *History of European Morals*, has devoted nearly one-half of the first volume to the consideration and refutation of the system. He has done it powerfully. Still, the way he speaks, the excessive care he takes not to offend by his expressions the upholders of the system, is a proof that he acknowledges the vast support it receives in our age from many theorists and writers. It must be said, with real grief, that all the convincing arguments Mr. Lecky uses against the system will not prevent it from prevailing ultimately. For nothing can do this except the reintegration of Christian ideas on morality; and neither Mr. Lecky nor any other writer in the same camp is prepared to undertake this, because he knows that the age is *unchristian*.

The logical consequence of all this is clear. The human conscience disappears entirely; and the reflections indulged in previously will naturally revert to the mind of the reader, and convince him that the moral ideas of the middle ages are the only ones which can save the human conscience from perishing.

Is not this the cause why the plane of intellect, of morality, of true happiness, has sank so remarkably during the last hundred years? Every one at this day, even the blind, begins to see and admit it. What is now the range of deep thinking in philosophy, of ideal in art, of nobleness and sublimity in poetry, of true generalization in science, of *genius* in fine, to include all in one word?

Mr. W. S. Lilly, in his article in the *Month* for June, on "Civilization of the Nineteenth Century," brings in quotations from J. S. Mill, Mr. Lecky, Mr. Carlisle, and De Tocqueville, powerfully bearing on that subject. We are reduced merely to refer to them.

Yet it is in the face of the strong contrast between the actual degeneracy, caused certainly by the *Liberal* principles now advocated, and the strong vitality of the middle ages, the result, no doubt, of the Christian maxims then in full vigor, that men of talent undoubtedly, but carrying their opposition to Christianity to the extent of fanaticism, have succeeded in persuading the lower classes in several European countries that the Church is, and has always been, their enemy; that she would reduce them, if she were allowed, to a strict servitude, as in the middle ages, and that she ought to be incessantly pursued by their unrelenting hostility. Artfully confounding feudalism with the institutions fostered by the Church, they have made her appear guilty of the ceaseless wars of those dark feudal times; they have pronounced her the cause of the occasional prevalence of might over right, so shocking at the time; although, if right at last prevailed, it was doubtless due to her exertions.

In the face of all the previous reflections and proofs, it is an actual fact that in all the great cities, and in a considerable portion

of the rural districts of France, the Church is every day cursed and blasphemed by the lower orders of the population, as if she were longing to bring back the harsh times of serfdom prevailing in their opinion anterior to the great revolution, a supposed wish on her part graphically expressed by the talismanic words: *The Tithes and Feudal Rights: La dime et les droits féodaux.*

At this moment these ominous words are not so frequently heard as they were, to the personal knowledge of the writer, at the beginning of this century. In fact, the same class of people in France does not even care to assign so flimsy a pretext as this as the cause of their hatred against the Church. They hate, *because they hate*, and for no other reason. A pamphlet just published by Bishop Dupanloup comes pertinently to our object, and cannot but produce a thrill of horror in those who read it attentively. It is headed: *Où allons nous?—Whither are we drifting?* A few passages from it will give the reader a more forcible idea of the strange phenomenon we are now studying, than could pages of an elaborate discussion of the subject.

The whole of it is a fearful picture of the inveterate hostility of many of the poor in France against Christianity; nay, not only against Christianity itself, but against all the truths of natural religion. It is the coarsest display of a radical atheism, of a low materialism, of a brutish and grovelling sensualism. It is, in fact, a kind of unreasoning madness, scarcely conceivable to men living in a sensible country like this. If ever the lower classes of France become to a great extent imbued with such a degrading spirit of unbelief, they will certainly be reduced to an undisguised barbarism, and differ from the savages of Dahomey only because they will not believe even in fetichism; and the bloody horrors of Whydah will undoubtedly be reproduced on the banks of the Seine and the Rhone. Yet the Bishop of Orleans is certainly a moderate writer, opposed, all his life, to the excesses of party spirit in France, on the side of conservatism as well as on that of radicalism. He shows first that the danger with which the Church is threatened in his country by the "people," is not a peril of insane theories only, a contest of mere ideas waged in the minds of men, big on paper, but never reduced to act. "The time of ideas, of theories, of systems is past," he says; "men have arrived at the point of hating God, and of declaring open war against Him. They are not satisfied with denying God and religion; they pursue both unrelentingly; they fight against both to the knife; they have declared against them a deadly war."

It is no more a question, therefore, of dissenting, of accusing, even of misrepresenting. The mob, inflamed to madness by its leaders, does not attempt to reason, to discuss, to accuse the

Church systematically, as a hundred years ago. They scarcely express any more their fear of the return of those times when tithes were paid to the clergy, and feudal rights were enjoyed by the aristocracy. The former universal outcry, *La dime et les droits féodaux*, is seldom heard. But instead of it there arises an outburst of blasphemy against everything formerly held sacred: "God must disappear, and not be any longer remembered;" "Our new revolution is atheistic; the name of God is scratched out of it." "Let us resolutely reject everything divine; we are on earth; fie on any aspiration towards heaven." "With the last priest, the last vestige of error shall disappear." These are a few of the dogmatic sentences read in a thousand of French pamphlets, sold wholesale to the people for two cents apiece. For this barbarian propagandism they have what they call *Popular libraries*, *Democratic libraries*, etc.; all for the use of the people of the lower orders of society.

If from their doctrine on God we pass to their axioms on man, on the soul, on human thought, on life, on death, we meet everywhere with the same outrages against reason itself and all common sense: "The inquiry into the origin of man is senseless; let him come from God or from the ape, it is the same as to his actual attributes." "Like all other animals, man has a brain; and that brain is organized for thought as the stomach is for digestion." "Consequently, thought is only the product of cerebral digestion." "Life is but a phase of metamorphosis of the spermatozoid larva." "Death is another phase of the same, a mere passage to another state of material being." Let the reader consider what conclusions can be drawn by uneducated people from such doctrines as these; yet the people to whom these lessons in metaphysics are given, devour this mental food placed in their hands for only two cents a pamphlet.

But they are not left to draw the conclusion themselves. The same pamphlets give it in black and white: "The simple mechanism of human volition excludes absolutely the childish notion of a free will." "Female modesty was invented by those of the women who were born ugly." "Morality is purely relative; many races of men seem to be fatally deprived of it, whilst several animal species furnish remarkable proofs that they possess it." "Moral good and moral evil vary in consequence of mere social conventionalities."

The Bishop of Orleans, after citing these quotations, and many others of the same import, justly remarks: "It is in these doctrines of atheism and materialism that the true origin of the ferocious hatred against the Church is to be found, the violent explosion of which we witness everywhere." Then he describes in the second part of his pamphlet the various and disgusting features of this new kind of madness. We must be satisfied with merely referring to it.

The special purpose, however, of these pages requires an allusion at least to some remarks and quotations of M. Dupanloup, in his eloquent denunciation of this abominable war. They refer to the evident objects of the chiefs of the party toward inoculating more and more, with their own gall and virus, the peasants, the working-men, the poor in general, the lower classes of the people, as they are called. These classes are already, in all the great cities of France and in many rural districts, deeply plunged in unbelief, and fiercely opposed to the Church and her ministers. But the radical leaders wish to complete the subservience of these poor, ignorant men to their own selfish schemes, by enlisting them all absolutely under the antichristian flag. They harp constantly in their journals, particularly in the *République Française*, the organ of M. Gambetta, on this hopeful theme of theirs: "The peasant," they say, "needs only to open his eyes in order to see that clericalism—that is the Church—is the centre of all perverse designs, of all conspiracies against him." "The clericals are full of tears of compassion for the workman's lot; but all they wish in their paternal hearts is to subject him again to all the restraints, all the slavish burdens under which he groaned during the middle ages," etc., etc. These calumnies, constantly repeated now for more than a hundred years, have already brutalized thousands of men in France. Their terrible effects have been visible enough every time there has been a revolution in that wretched country. The shooting of priests, the destruction of religious emblems, the desecration and devastation of churches, the closing or demolishing of convents, have always been the necessary accompaniments of these popular outbreaks. We say popular, because unfortunately a part of the people itself has then acted, and showed its real feelings. Its anti-religious rage was a glaring proof of the immense change effected in the French rural populations, in some parts of the country at least. But it must be said, and without fear of contradiction, that on the next subversion of society that shall happen in France, if it is really radical, if the lower orders are allowed to have their full sway, the horrors that will be perpetrated will certainly surpass any of those which have already horrified mankind. And this, because now, speaking openly as they do, they boast of their determination to do their work so completely this time, that there will be no fear of another resurrection of the Christianity they detest. Many declarations of this kind could be extracted from the innumerable penny pamphlets which have lately appeared. The writers have openly adopted the phrase of Garibaldi, who once said to a crowd of Italian students: "Every man born on this earth ought simply to tear away the street pavement, and revenge himself on those hypocrites, wherever they are met with, clad in their black cassocks." Barodet,

in the *Rappel* has given to the sentence a French-Spartan air, by exclaiming, "Let the republicans form themselves into a serried phalanx against the *black* International Association." The very titles of most of their pamphlets show their rage against the clergy, and their purpose of communicating their fury to the lowest ranks of the population. A short list of them is given by Bishop Dupanloup, forcible and pithy for Frenchmen who can understand their slang; to the greater number of Americans it would be almost worse than Chinese. The rabid spirit itself which has dictated them is scarcely comprehensible in this country, where nothing of the kind exists. To have a slight idea of it the reader ought to picture to himself those thousands of "unemployed workingmen," who in their lamentable distress are now preparing some *demonstration* or other; not, indeed, contenting themselves, as they do here, with calling on the city authorities for work, but openly proclaiming in posters, on their flags, and in numerous inflammatory pamphlets, that they are going to fall—not on the rich, as yet, whose turn will soon come; not on banks and moneyed institutions—but on the splendid churches which line the avenues, and on the clergymen who officiate in them, because, forsooth, the Church is the cause of all their misery. Nobody in this country would understand this, and everybody would say, the workingmen are mad. This is precisely what takes place in France, where the Church has no more to do with public abuses than in this country, notwithstanding what the Paris correspondents of some American journals may write, one of whom stated on the 8th of last August, that "a victory for the clericals is a check to the cause of good government in France." The previous remarks, however, on the misconception of the middle ages in Europe, and the confusion arising from some ugly features existing at the time wholly unconnected with the clergy, and totally at variance with the Christian principles which alone the Church stood up for and enforced, can give persons in this country an inkling into the causes of a moral phenomenon otherwise perfectly inexplicable.

This enlistment of popular fury against the Church is not carried on in France alone. The same is taking place openly in Belgium and Switzerland; the same is being prepared also for fair Italy, and Garibaldi during his long career has been earnestly working for it. Did not the antichristian portion of the people of Catholic Belgium attempt quite lately to sack churches and religious establishments, merely because the previous political elections had not resulted to their liking? Was not the government forced, against its will, to call out its armed police and its soldiery to protect what of all things on earth is most worthy of respect? Every one is by this time aware to what excess of infidel fanaticism the rabble in Switzerland

has lately gone in its blind hatred of the religion of Christ. That it has not yet gone so far in Italy, is not the fault of Garibaldi and his compeers. But that the same latent force against Catholicity is at work even there cannot be doubted for a moment by any intelligent man. This is, in fact, the case wherever the revolutionary spirit spreads. The Church must oppose it, for it cannot be reconciled with Christian morality. It is radically opposed to the commandments of God, and if successful would be the greatest scourge which could be inflicted on mankind. No one has yet fathomed all the individual miseries and public calamities which would follow in its wake. What was witnessed in France at the end of the last century could scarcely furnish a shadow of what society would suffer if it were to become universal and embrace the whole of Europe, as it threatens to do. Who, therefore, can suppose that the Church would do anything in regard to it but anathematize it? And, mind you, the Church alone can effectually fight it out and conquer it. The European sovereigns do not see this; they are blind, and play with the lightning, and dance on volcanoes. The "popular" party, as it is called, has more sound understanding than all modern statesmen; the popular party knows that the Church alone is able to check it and deal it its deathblow. This is the real cause of its antagonism to the Church.

The noisy outcry relative to the middle ages is only a bugbear. The chiefs of the revolutionists are fully convinced that those times can never return, even if the Church wished it, and were she ten times more powerful, politically, than she is. That there is even a bare possibility of ever re-establishing in France, or anywhere else in Europe, *la dime, et les droits féodaux, et le droit du Seigneur*, or any other of the mediæval abuses, is as ludicrous a supposition as any of the renowned Munchausen stories. The chiefs of radicalism know this full well. But they know likewise the credulity of the ignorant men they lead, since these have been brutalized by the loss of their former faith. All these French phrases have as many fearful meanings as there are heads among the unbelieving lower orders; and they are goaded to madness by the uttering of them, as was the Irish fishwoman—according to the story—when O'Connell called her a *parallelopipedon*.

The extent of this evil in Europe has attained huge proportions. What would have seemed impossible five or six hundred years ago, namely, that any of the people would ever curse the Church and call for her destruction, is a deplorable fact; and during the last forty or fifty years it has undergone large developments. Is it possible to check it and, at least, prevent it from spreading further? Is it likely that the scales will ever be turned, the people return to their allegiance to the Church, and find again in her the remedy for

all their moral distempers? A few words on these two questions will naturally conclude a subject pregnant with the highest interest for every man of mind, and full of portentous consequences in the near future.

First, it is consoling to reflect that the importance of the matter in question is fully understood in Europe by all the leaders of what is called Catholic opinion. These gentlemen are numerous at this hour, have already acquired a real power over *the masses*, as the neological expression has it, and show their earnestness by their readiness to submit to any sacrifice for so holy a cause. They have, consequently, established associations called *Cercles d'Ouvriers* in all the large cities of France and Belgium. Besides evening schools opened for their benefit, they have for them courses of lectures in winter where all the falsehoods or misconceptions of the opposite party are rebutted, and the innumerable benefits that have accrued to mankind from Christianity are openly proclaimed before those men, used previously to hear only the calumnies and misjudgments of the radical speakers or papers. At this moment a large number of workingmen in Paris have openly enlisted under the flag of the Church. For, mind you, it is a real intellectual war prior to the muscular contest which it is expected will follow. The great Count de Mun is at the head of this powerful organization; and under him many gentlemen of the highest rank in France are engaged to labor incessantly for the salvation of their poor countrymen. We see by the late periodicals that the probability we predicted in a previous paper, of his being ejected from the Republican Assembly, at Versailles, has turned out to be a fact. The majority have declared that he was unduly elected because of "clerical influence" in his election. As the same gentlemen consider "Clericalism" as a political party in France—and it is really so, since the word "clerical" is applied by them not only to clergymen but to all laymen likewise who generally support measures favorable to the Church—their vote amounted to a decision made, for instance, by the House of Representatives in Congress against the due election of a Democratic member in New York, *because Tammany Hall had supported his election!*

At any rate, Count de Mun is free again to canvass the whole of France for the increase of his "Cercles d'Ouvriers." In Versailles he would have been absolutely unable to turn the Assembly from its radical leanings; and most probably not a single measure proposed by his initiative, or supported by his wonderful eloquence, would have obtained a majority. His presence there would, consequently, have been scarcely profitable, except as a strong protest against the injustice of the measures those gentlemen of the majority proposed to pass. Others will be there to protest, and mean-

while Count de Mun will continue to appear day after day in the midst of his enthusiastic followers, viz., the thousands of artisans and laborers whom he has already enlisted on the side of the Church and Christianity.

There is a peculiarity about those Frenchmen of the lower orders which it is good to take into consideration. They are savages when lashed into fury; they will tear to pieces those whom they regard as their enemies; they will run into excesses which barbarians alone are generally supposed to be capable of. Read some of the scenes described in the *Moniteur* during the French Revolution, or any faithful history of those times. Read again the details published in this country during the horrible sway of the Commune of Paris in 1870. You seem to be transported to Dahomey or Ashantee, or to the court of the irascible Mtesa sending his wives to execution. Go and see the same men the day after the perpetration of their horrible crimes; you will find them in "the bosom of their families," full of tenderness for their wives and children, speaking with you with calmness as if powerfully actuated by humane feelings. You will incline naturally to believe that all the reports of the atrocities committed by them were false, or, at least, immensely exaggerated. The writer has conversed with Americans who, two or three years ago being in Paris, took the trouble of going to Belleville and other places in the neighborhood, known to be still occupied by the population which acquired justly such an atrocious reputation. They entered the houses of those *monstrous beings*, and after repeated conversations with them they came back convinced that they had been calumniated. "They were, after all, good people," these American visitors repeated, and repeat everywhere. No doubt those communists speak and act like "good people," when not under the terrible sway of their fell passions. But when once under their impulse, they are as complete barbarians as the youthful pages of Mtesa, as the executioners at the "customs" of Dahomey, as were the horrible tools of the *Montagne* at the massacre of the prisoners kept purposely for a barbarous immolation *aux Carmes, à la Force*, and in the other *maisons de détention* into which they had been brought from every quarter of Paris, in September, 1792.

Their madness is merely owing to the tales they have heard about those "hypocritical clericals," intent only on plundering them, enslaving them, preventing them from rising in the world, which is the great object of their ambition, since they have been entirely deprived of their faith and left in the most forlorn situation, without the least hope of, or aspiration for, heaven which they foolishly blaspheme.

Enlighten them gently; prove to them by positive facts that you

are their friends, that you wish them good; chiefly, induce them gradually to return to the faith of their childhood, nay, to the ardent devotion yet preserved by their wives and mothers,—as is very often the case—and you will be surprised at the change which will come over them. They will soon bewail their former blindness, and repair by great acts of self-sacrifice their previous life of error and sin. Some of them will turn out to be heroes of faith and virtue. In spite of the terrible delusion under which they have so long acted and degraded themselves, they will show that there is in them a great deal of good at bottom. A recent writer has lately given, in two quite large volumes, strong reasons for believing that the great mass of the French people is yet of Gaulish extraction: that is, they are Celts. The author certainly brings powerful proofs for asserting that the Roman conquest had not the least influence on the primitive race of the inhabitants of France; that the German invasions contributed very little to effect a change in blood; that all the subsequent events which have acted on the nation have but confirmed the original characteristics of the race. It is not to be doubted that this is true, more particularly of the lower classes of the French people. The upper ranks of society partook, most probably in a higher degree, of the tribal leanings of the German invaders; the "people" must have remained nearly the same. They are still Celts, therefore, and show it still by their impulsive and often unreflecting nature. But it is generally admitted that religious feeling is almost inseparable from the natural bent of the Celts. When they appear to have lost it, it can be restored by convincing them of their error. As soon as they come to perceive that they have been made the victims of a gross deception, by which they have been deluded into hating the Church without cause; that their ancestors did *not* groan under clerical despotism; were *not* reduced to slavery nor serfdom by monks and priests; that they were *not* the tools of priestcraft until the great revolution of 1789, there will be in them a reversal of feeling which may astonish the world. This is what Count de Mun and his associates are now laboring to effect. After these French workingmen or peasants have once consented to hear—this is the main point—they will soon recognize in the Church an old friend of a thousand years. As soon as they know what bishops, priests, monks have done for their ancestors; the real difference between the mediæval principles and those of Liberalism; the necessity, for the happiness of the poor, of believing in God and heaven; the claims of virtue, and the natural abhorrence which vice should excite; they will listen again to the voice of conscience, which the sophisms of pretended friends had nearly extinguished in them; and the return to faith and the practice of religion, which the last twenty years

have witnessed in the upper ranks of society in France, will be still more remarkable among peasants and workingmen, as it is proper it should be. For in all countries and under all governments religion speaks with more authority and efficiency to the heart of the poor than to that of the rich; and the claims of the Gospel on those whom Christ blessed in a most especial manner are of so peculiar a nature that they have never, in any nation, been deaf to it for any long time. This is the sure foundation on which rests the hope that the French "people" will return to their former allegiance, and this time never to again renounce it; and the Liberal principles will then in vain be offered to them for acceptance. The outcry, after all, against the existence of God, against the belief in a hereafter, against the superiority of the soul over the body, is not raised permanently and successfully for the deception of those who suffer, and whose existence during this life is scarcely tolerable. We cannot do better, in conclusion, than quote the words of Victor Hugo himself on the subject. We copy from the London *Month* of June last, merely translating the passage of the novel of *Claude Gueux* cited in the *Month*:

"Give to the toiling suffering masses, for whom this world is becoming truly evil, belief in a better world made for them, and they will keep quiet, they will be patient. Patience is built up of hope. Whatever you may do, the lot of the mass of mankind, of the many, of the far greater number, will always be relatively poor, miserable, sad. To them is assigned the heavy work—burdens to drag, burdens to carry. Look well into that pair of scales: all the enjoyments in that of the rich, all the sufferings in that of the poor. Are not the two shares most unequal? Shall not the balance, of necessity, incline on one side, and the State with it? But now, in the share of the poor, in the scale of sufferings, throw in the certainty of a heavenly hereafter, throw in a warm aspiration toward eternal happiness, throw in paradise, that magnificent counter-weight, and the scales keep on a level. The share of the poor is at least equal to that of the rich. *This Jesus knew.*"

WHAT THE CHURCH AND THE POPES HAVE DONE FOR THE SCIENCE OF GEOGRAPHY.

Recherches Géographiques et Critiques sur le livre "De Mensura Orbis Terræ," composé en Irlande au commencement du neuvième siècle, par Dicuil, suivies du texte restitué, par A. Letronne.
Paris, 1814.

Dei Vantaggi dalla Cattolica Religione derivati alla Geografia e Scienze annesse. Dissertazione letta nell'Accademia di Religione Cattolica nel giorno 23 di Maggio, 1822, dal Padre D. Placido Zurla, Abate Camaldoiese. Roma, 1822.

Les Papes Géographes et la Cartographie du Vatican. Par M. R. Thomassy. Paris, 1852.

THE spotless spouse of Christ has her own peculiar mission—"all the glory of that daughter of the King is within"—in that deposit of supernatural truth which she holds, and with it her co-operation in the work of man's redemption, but she has too her external splendor "in borders of gold, clothed round about with varieties." Around that living centre of supernatural truth, the transcendent; the essential, other truths of the natural order must by their very nature revolve, drawn and attracted by the superior and the grand. In the harmony established by Him who is essentially Truth itself, the truths of the lower order must fit in on the hem as it were of the higher, like a robe of beauty.

The Church was not established to diffuse over the world truths of the natural order, the science of the material universe, but in her glorious mission, with the only solid basis of the relation of the seen to the unseen, she has ever been the guide, the regulator, the cautious fosterer of human sciences.

Her action has not, of course, escaped cavil and censure, nor has it always received the praise it merited, or been appreciated from the proper standpoint. Her mission is to guide souls to heaven by supernatural truth and supernatural means: where human science, art, or learning tends to aid in this great work she favors and encourages; where it becomes an instrument to create doubt and perplexity, to weaken faith, to dispel hope or dampen charity, she lays a restraining hand till all danger is past; so the Church in the Old Law destroyed the Brazen Serpent, made by God's command for the temporal good of the people, when it proved a source of spiritual evil.

She can be no enemy to scientific truth, for truth is one, but every theory that seems plausible or solves difficulties is not neces-

sarily true, and the fact that a theory is used to counteract the great work of salvation, excites a suspicion that justifies a suspension of judgment, till by becoming established as a truth the theory comes to aid, instead of hampering the great work.

Through ages of barbarism, of ruin and decay, of destruction and blind groping for light, the Church has come down, the ark, bearing learning, art, science, culture, and refinement. Eloquence has paid the highest tributes to the services she has thus rendered to mankind, even the eloquence of those who denied her supernatural claims.

But what she has done for geographical science is too often overlooked. And yet here she was more than any other, in her own sphere, preserving, acquiring, combining, and ordering knowledge essential to her own work, and nevertheless a benefit to all men.

God made of one kindred all the nations of the earth; sin scattered and divided them, rearing walls of brazen hate between nation and nation. The command to the Church, to go and teach all nations, broke down the wall and gathered the nations once more into brotherhood.

The Apostles went out on their great work, and as they proceeded, gathering the believers into churches, a correspondence grew up between these bodies, each imparting its own trials and triumphs, sympathizing with each other in their spiritual gain, aiding each other in distress, and all turning by their earliest teaching to the holy city, Jerusalem, and the city where St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles and his successors, presided.

From the shores of India, and the unknown sources of the Nile, from the wandering Scythian and the unconquered German, from the mountains of Spain and the far-removed British isles, came men to venerate the spots hallowed by the footsteps of our Redeemer, or to seek counsel or blessing from his Vicar. They might come as strangers amid the pomp and luxury of Roman towns to the very centre of the imperial power, but in the presence of the lowly bishop who bore the dangerous honor, sure in those days of the martyr's crown, that Christian from afar was no stranger; he was a son in the presence of his father. He came to one who knew of his land and of the struggling church within its limits; he told of its hopes and its prospects, of its progress and its gain. If a bishop, he detailed the advancement of the faith, and left an account of his diocese and of those near him. If a man in civil authority, he too would give descriptions to guide the missionaries whom he sought for his people. Each successive pilgrim found his land better known to the venerable Pontiff and his associate priests, lurking in the catacombs, to escape for a time the fury of imperial power.

And when messengers went forth from that peaceful kingdom they penetrated to distant realms, where no courier of the Cæsar dare set his foot, went with ample knowledge to places and countries of which the learned men of Rome had but a misty and uncertain idea.

The great geographer Ptolemy flourished in the time of the emperors Adrian and Marcus Aurelius, embodying all that was known to the pagan rulers of the empire and their advanced schools in the second century, as the maps of Agathodæmon do for the fifth century, yet the writings of the Fathers down to those times show that the Church was far beyond the State and its men of science in a knowledge of the geography of the world.

Without insisting on the labors of the Apostles, St. Andrew and St. Philip, in Scythia and Sogdiana; St. Thaddeus and St. Thomas, in Persia, Parthia, Media, Chaldea, and India; St. Matthew, in Nubia and Abyssinia, as to which even among Catholic writers diversity of opinion exists, it is certain that the Christians of India and the neighboring countries numbered among their bishops and other teachers in the earliest centuries St. Frumentius, Edesius, Theophilus, and Pantænus. John, bishop of Persia and India, is among the Fathers who signed the acts of the Council of Nice, in 325; St. Jerome in his epistle to Læta mentions the numbers of monks in his time in India, Persia, and Ethiopia. Archelaus, Bishop of Cashgar, as early as 280 opposed the heresy of Manes, as St. Epiphanius relates.

And yet these are only incidental allusions or mentions, showing evidently that a full ecclesiastical record of the time would have been a more complete geography than the learned men of paganism dreamed of, when the shadowy Thule was all they knew beyond Albion; when the Cimbric Chersonese and Germany, vaguely delineated, limited their knowledge on the north; the Caspian, Bactriana, the Ganges, on the east, and the vague indefinite Ethiopia, and the dimly-known Fortunate Islands, on the south.

Thus geographical knowledge was gathered in the councils of the Popes. Fathers of the Christian world, no part of it was without interest to them. The Church fostered alike the geographical knowledge embodied in the Bible, and what Greece had gathered and compiled. The Scripture geography, after the hand of God had crushed the kingdoms of Israel and of Juda and scattered their people in the lands of bondage and exile, would have fallen into oblivion, had not the Scriptures been translated into the Greek, then becoming a universal language. The translators, exiles in Egypt, knew alike the Hebrew and Greek names of places, and all that concerned the natural history of their desolated country. In interpreting the sacred books they could scarcely have gone astray

on the most trivial point. The Church rendering into Latin the inspired books, had the services of St. Jerome, living amid the very scenes of Holy Writ, with the Septuagint before him, and the tradition of Hebrew scholars to support him. The Vulgate is thus doubly valuable for the geography and natural history of the Holy Land; and science is now rating at its due worthlessness the English Protestant translation, which, discarding in brilliant ignorance these sure guides, struck out a wild system of translation that makes it a mass of errors, for geographer and naturalist to disentangle and correct. Geographical truth and religious truth remained with the Catholic Church, while doctrinal and scientific error alike marked the separatists of the sixteenth century.

Scriptural geography was not a mere study. In the Church it was something of practical use. The Holy Land was a land of pilgrimage to the Christian world; the Jewish law had been one of pilgrimage. Jerusalem at its great feasts was the point to which the faithful journeyed from every division of Juda and Israel. When scattered in distant lands the Jews still felt obliged from time to time to visit the Holy City and take part in one of the great solemnities of the temple. The record of Pentecost shows us Jews from every land, from the Tiber to the Ganges, and from remote Abyssinia the eunuch of Queen Candace journeyed to offer up prayer and sacrifice in the temple of the living God.

The temple of Solomon with the Ark of the Covenant and the Tables of the Law was holy. Holy even the second temple, though these sacred deposits, hidden by Jeremias, were not replaced within its walls; but holy as these had been to the Jew, far holier to the Christian were Calvary and the Mount of Olives, were the points that marked the way of the Cross, were Bethlehem and Nazareth, Cana and Bethany.

To direct the pilgrims from various lands itineraries were formed, guiding the pious of each country on his course from his home to the sacred scenes of Redemption. From the *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, numbers of these have been preserved to our days, showing how the Church in her own vocation yet contributed to science. Many a point as to routes of trade and travel, as to ports that had dwindled away, or new emporiums that arose, depends for its solution now on these itineraries of the early Catholic pilgrims.

But the Church gave more. Her monks and clergy visiting the Holy Land brought back clearer notions of foreign countries, and imparted more accurate knowledge. The Holy Land was too great an object of interest to be long undescribed.

Thus the Church in her natural operation, in her constant tendency to bring the other sheep who were not of the fold within her bosom, so as to form but one sheepfold under one shepherd, kept

up constant communication between all parts of her ever-extending realm and the two great centres, Jerusalem and Rome.

Missionaries going from the See of Peter, or returning to report the result of their labors, bishops, priests, and people visiting Rome as pilgrims, or for the affairs of the Church, formed one class; the pilgrims to the Holy Land another.

All availed themselves of what antiquity had left to guide them on their way and make their journey instructive; and they noted for the benefit of others the changes wrought by time, by wars, invasions, and the violent movements of nature. They revised and corrected the earlier geographers, to conform their accounts to the actual position of affairs, often requiring an entirely new description, leaving to scholars possessed of leisure to harmonize the old and the new.

Others again described as their starting-points lands unknown or barely described on vague rumors by the earlier writers.

From the material thus collected arose two classes of works elaborated in the quiet of cloisters: the first were new editions of Ptolemy, Strabo, Pomponius Mela, Solinus, embodying recent knowledge of the condition of the countries described, with the results of such explorations and discoveries as added new territory beyond the limits known to the earlier writers; the second were new contributions, which without employing the ancient writers gave for actual use, as guide-books, contemporary descriptions in detail of the Holy Land, and in some cases of other countries. It is a curious fact that we possess an early example typifying each of these classes, written by Irish monks. Saint Adamnan, of Ra-phoe, Abbot of Hy, author of the *Life of St. Columba*, wrote a work, *De Locis Sanctis*, which is the base of many subsequent treatises on the Holy Land; and about the year 800 Dicuil, another Irish monk, wrote his work, *De Mensura Orbis Terræ*, a general geographical work, bringing down the knowledge of earlier writers to his own time, and embodying details as to the explorations of his countrymen on the Atlantic.

Ireland, it may be said, was then especially active in study and research, but we can scarcely believe that she stood alone, and that some similar works were not compiled in the monasteries and cloisters of other lands.

Rome was certainly not inactive. As the centre to which pilgrim and clergy tended; as the place where missionaries reported on new fields of labor or sought the canonical organization of a new-formed church, Rome necessarily received details as to the extent, nature, and resources of each country, to enable the Holy See to act understandingly. The knowledge scattered in widely separated churches and monasteries would thus naturally be brought

together in the archives of the Pope. Thus the great religious idea of the Church's world-wide mission made science her handmaid for increasing its usefulness for her great work, and for the good of mankind.

It must not be supposed that this theory of an accumulation of geographical knowledge at Rome is a mere hypothesis, with no basis but the pious wish of an earnest adherent of the Church. If Adamnan and Dicuil show geographical knowledge and science, cultivated in one of the remote corners of the Christian world, proof exists attesting the reality of the general geographical knowledge possessed at Rome, and of the importance attached to it by the Holy See. "Surpassing Augustus and Agrippa, who painted on their walls a map of the Roman Empire, the sovereign Pontiffs, rulers of a far wider empire, depicted on the walls of the Lateran palace a map of the whole world. This work of art and science dates back to the earlier part of the eighth century. Of Pope Zacharias (741-752), we read: 'Hic in Lateranensi patriarchio ante basilicam beatæ memoriæ Theodori papæ a novo fecit triclinium . . . ubi et orbis terrarum descriptionem depinxit atque diversis versiculis ornavit.' 'He restored the triclinium in the Lateran palace before the basilica of Pope Theodore, of blessed memory, and painted on its walls a description of the world and adorned it with various inscriptions.—*Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, ed. 1602, p. 112."

What had the Church gained up to this time? Ireland, scarcely known by name to Greece and Rome, was occupied, fully explored, full of seats of learning, diffusing light over the north, over Scandinavia on the east, and the islands of the gloomy ocean on the west. The faith had been borne through Scotland; thence Irish monks carried the faith to the Shetland, Orkney, and Ferroe Islands, adding them to the domain of science. The Ferroe Islands, inhabited at an early day by Irish hermits, were retained by them as a favorite retreat till the heathen Danes ravaged them about 725. Saint Brendan, of Clonfert, had already in the sixth century, advancing in the rude coracles of his country through the dangerous sea, reached Iceland, bringing back a knowledge of its volcanoes, of the icebergs, of the long polar days and nights, each measured by days. This island, as we see by Dicuil, was not only known but colonized by the Irish, and the Scandinavian annals attest the fact that religious articles, books, bells, etc., left by Irish priests, were found by them on their first visits to the island.¹

St. Brendan's voyage, distorted and altered by the fancy of narrators in prose and verse, became the great legend of the Middle

¹ Dicuil, *De Mensura*, c. vii., § 3; Letronne's *Observations*, pp. 131-146.

Ages, but in the wildest form we can see the underlying truth, and its authentic accounts were received by scholars. His island found place on maps, though located most wildly. He heard too of islands beyond, one of which, termed in Irish, *Hy Brasail*, long figured on maps in various positions, and the name, given at last to a part of the New World, is still borne by the great empire of the Western Continent, making it commemorate the labors of the early Christian explorers, the Irish monks.¹

Then from Ireland went missionaries to Saxon England, and with converts from that land, pushed onward to the immemorial forests of Germany and Scandinavia, warring on Woden and Thor in their very fastnesses, and tracing with sweat and blood the courses of rivers and mountains, the divisions of tribes.

The letters of these early missionaries betray at every turn their interest in geography; and what can be a more striking proof than the dispute between the English St. Boniface and the Irish St. Feargall or Virgil, which began in regard to the validity of a doubtful baptism, but when finally referred to Rome included a debate as to the shape of the earth, the existence of the Antipodes, and the possibility of circumnavigation?

In the midst of the forests of Germany, with pagan hordes around them, among men utterly devoid of letters or science, these missionaries discussed cosmography, and laid the matter before Rome as the seat of science and of faith. The Pontiff Zachary, with his mural maps, sustained the clearer knowledge of the Irish missionary, who soon became bishop of Salzburg.

In this pontiff's day the Weser, Elbe, Oder, and Danube could be laid down, and St. Anscharius, Archbishop of Hamburg, claim jurisdiction over Iceland and even Greenland. These last countries, of which Europe now first heard, soon received bishops of their own; monasteries of Benedictines and Dominicans arose amid the northern ice, and bishop and religious, impelled still by the pristine zeal, bore the cross and science to Vinland and other portions of the New World.

In the East the monks of the Thebais penetrated into Nubia and Abyssinia, spreading and reviving the faith, and bringing accounts of the source of the Nile, as men are now doing a thousand years later. Monks of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia traversed India, Thibet, and reached China, where monuments of Christianity of a

¹ Cardinal Zurla, speaking of St. Brendan and of his islands, which were one of the points of Columbus's search, remarks: "Under this point of view no slight glory redounds to our St. Brendan (he claims him as a fellow Benedictine), not only to have extended the limits of geography in those hitherto unknown regions of ocean, but to have perchance struck the first sparks that guided the Genoese Tiphys in giving us a new world."

very early date still exist, and the heralds of the cross brought back not only definite accounts of those remote countries, but bestowed on the Emperor Justinian the first silk cocoons seen in Europe, the fruitful source of the silkworms of Greece and Italy; all springing from the few that missionaries concealed in their hollow staffs.

Two causes now arose, which not only checked for a time this rapid extension of geographical knowledge, but destroyed much that had been acquired, and was not generally diffused.

The successful inroads of the Danes and Northmen in the West, and the fearful growth and extension of the Mohammedan power in the East, swept away whole communities of Christians; church and shrine, monastery and school, the library, with the treasures of ancient learning and the records of later experience, perished in some places utterly and irremediably. The Church in time won to the faith the fierce pagans of the North, but the sectaries of Mahomet have ever proved deaf to the voice of truth.

The earlier geography of the East and of Northern Africa, based on that of the Roman empire, now became useless. States with new names, new cities, new governments and customs arose, all that was human changed; naught but the everlasting hills, the stream and forest, and the sea that seemed to mourn the past, remained.

To study and map out this new East became a task, which there was no European government to undertake or encourage. Again the Church came forward to assume the task. In the hand of the infidel, as in the hand of the pagan, the holy places were still objects of deepest reverence to all whom the Church imbued with a spirit of piety. Amid new and untold dangers the Christian pilgrims from all directions hastened to Rome and to Jerusalem.

Itineraries like that of the Saxon St. Willibald describe the Holy Land in the eighth century, and others keep up the chain of positive knowledge through the next few ages. But the wrongs, extortions, and outrages to which these Christian pilgrims were subjected increased, till at last when all Europe was threatened by the insolence of Moslem power on land and sea, the religious idea called Christendom to arms, that by their united efforts the Saracen power might be broken, the holy places rescued, and Europe itself saved from these invading hordes. A closer union among the Christian powers, a renewed spirit of faith, experience on the sea, all resulted from the Crusades. They failed to effect the permanent rescue of the Holy Land, but they saved Europe for a time by making Asia the battle-ground. The Greek, ever thwarting the Crusader, from his antagonism to Rome, found too late that he was left alone to meet the Turk.

A familiarity with the geography, resources, and divisions of

Asia, and with their products and industries, was one of the marked consequences of the Crusades. The East became the great object of religious zeal and of commercial adventure. Then arose the great missionary bodies in the Church, the sons of St. Francis and St. Dominic, and they, with Benedictine, Carmelite, Augustinian, spread to all parts of Asia, and their fearless intrepidity knew no obstacle in the savageness of man, the ruggedness of the land, or the extremes of heat or cold. The Sovereign Pontiffs, continuing doubtless in their mural maps the progress of discovery, made these new missionaries their envoys to the remotest parts. Innocent IV. dispatched the Dominican Simon of St. Quentin to Nouyan Batchou, commanding the Tartars in Persia; the friar John de Plan Carpan was nuncio to Tartary in 1247, traversing Bohemia, Poland, Russia, Cumana on the Black Sea, and Cashgar. Franciscans and Dominicans, sent by the same Pope to Genghis Khan, drew up reports which can be read in Ramusio. The friar William de Rusbruis, a few years later, with friar Bartholomew de Cremona, laid open a whole series of countries in Asia. In 1271 the Dominican William of Tripoli and Nicholas of Vicenza were dispatched by Pope Gregory X. to the Khan, and were accompanied by Marco Polo, whose accounts of the interior of Asia became better known than the more modest narratives of the pious religious who preceded him. In 1289 Nicholas IV. sent John of Montecorvino to the Mongol Khan in Persia. This zeal of the Sovereign Pontiffs to win to the faith the conquering Tartar, added rich treasures of knowledge to the imperfect descriptions, and corrected many errors as to the lands controlled by these warlike hordes.

The successors of the Apostles again, after the lapse of ages, penetrated China. John de Montecorvino was made by Pope Clement V. Archbishop of Khan Balyq, or Pekin, and soon had a number of suffragan bishops. The Blessed Oderic of Friuli visited almost every country in Asia in his wonderful mission-life, and his companion James, an Irish friar, after continuing his work, returned to Ireland, bearing with him Blessed Oderic's geographical treatise, *De Partibus Infidelium*, describing most of the States of Asia, and showing the extent of his labors. The manuscript escaping the destruction which befell so many valuable manuscripts at the hands of the English, was carried to Ratisbon in 1529, and has recently been printed.¹

Pekin was not the only archiepiscopal see of these new missions, for we find in 1330 John de Cor made Archbishop of Solthanyeh.

The letters and reports of these missions are replete with details

¹ P. Marcello da Civezza, *Storia delle Missioni Francescane*, vol. iii., pp. 739-781.

as to the countries embraced in their field of labor, and these were all the more precious, as they filled a space in cosmographies, which had hitherto been a blank or a conjecture. But the information was not always easily acquired. The Franciscan Pascal de Vitoria, martyred by the Moslem Tartars in 1342, was not the first or only one to fall like a Christian hero.

Asia, from the Mediterranean to the China Sea, from the inhospitable wastes of Siberia to the Indian peninsula, was thus included in ecclesiastical geography; religion could point to the great cities where her bishops presided, the towns and spots where monasteries and convents attempted to diffuse at once the religion of Jesus Christ and the science of Europe.

Africa was not overlooked. The northern provinces, where the See of St. Augustine was once but one amid hundreds, that land of Latin civilization to which we doubtless owe our Vulgate version of the Bible in its earlier form, was now Saracen, without bishop or church, almost without a Christian, and its actual condition was unknown and unexplored. The earliest band of Franciscans who entered Morocco gave their lives as a penalty for their zeal, but their brethren were undismayed, and some light was gathered, some light diffused. Algiers, Tunis, and Fez, all became fields of Franciscan labor; while Trinitarian and Mercedarian studied their geography to carry out their heroic and charitable work of ransoming captives.

The collection of geographical data brought from all quarters to Rome, had already begun with the commerce that had grown up in the Italian States to make cosmography and navigation peculiarly the studies of the peninsula. While Marco Polo explores as a student and traveller the interior of China, the Zeni brothers, also Italians, visit the coast of Greenland and the adjoining shores, pioneers of the race of Italian navigators and cosmographers, pupils of the Church and profiting by her work, who in succeeding centuries identified their names with all the new discoveries.

During the great schism of the West, the papal influence in exploration and foreign missions suffered, and the absence of the Sovereign Pontiffs from Rome was injurious to science and to art, no less than to religion. Yet even in this period we meet testimonies of the interest in geography manifested by the Popes. Rienzi, in 1350, accused Pope Boniface VIII. with concealing an ancient map of Germany and Italy engraved on bronze.

In the fifteenth century evidences of the care given by the Popes to geographical science meet us on all sides, from the commencement to the close of that age. The first translation of Ptolemy was made in 1409 by James Angelo, who dedicated his work to Pope Alexander V. The learned Cardinal Peter d'Ailly praises

this work in his *Imago Mundi*, written in 1410, a work prized by Columbus, whose copy, bearing marginal notes in the great discoverer's handwriting, is still preserved. D'Ailly was one of the first in those days to raise the theory, advanced of old by Aristotle, Ptolemy, and Pytheas, that the Indies were at no great distance from Spain, a theory to which we owe the discovery of America. Another prince of the Church in that day, Cardinal William Filastre, sent to a library which he had founded at Rheims a continuation of Ptolemy, giving the actual condition of the known world.

The spirit of discovery inflamed the minds of all, and the rival nations of the western peninsula of Europe, Spain, and Portugal, looking out upon the inscrutable ocean, sought to solve its mysteries. The rivalry that might have led to angry and hostile action was appeased by the action of Pope Eugene IV., who in 1438 drew the first line of demarcation, deciding that the Spaniards should sail westward, and the Portuguese to the south, confirming to each all that they might discover. The decision was a prophecy of what Vasco de Gama and Columbus were to effect. A bull of Nicholas V. confirmed this important step.

Bartholomew de Pareto, acolyte to Pope Calixtus III., shows in a map executed by him at Genoa, in 1456, that the Pontifical palace was still the favored home of geographical studies. The map of this learned priest is engraved. It lays down not only the Canaries, or Fortunate Islands, but also the islands of St. Brendan, and still further westward Antilia and Roillo—the former undoubtedly the origin of the name Antilles, still on maps in our day.

Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini, who became Pope under the name of Pius II., was one of the learned men of his time. He was especially given to geographical studies, and in the cosmography which he prepared, combines extensive erudition, vast contemporaneous research, and sound criticism. He applied himself to one point, which every century invested with fresh difficulties. This was, from a study of the best ancient geographical works and the various itineraries and other similar works compiled from time to time, to fix the exact position of ancient places no longer known, and to show this with reference to the nearest modern towns. Based on solid critical grounds, he is led away by no fancies.

His secretary, Hondius, to whom Mabillon attributes the use of the Christian era in dates, carried out the plan of Pius II. in still greater detail in a special work on Italy.

About the same time the Camaldolese Dom Mauro compiled a map of the world, of singular merit and excellence, in its judicious use of all known material.

The influence of such a Pope was felt, and Italy soon produced a series of editions of Ptolemy, which are invaluable as showing

the gradual discoveries of this period. The first edition was issued at Vicenza in 1475; three years later an edition was issued at Rome, with maps. The printer, Buckink, received all encouragement from Pope Sixtus IV., the ardent restorer of art and science, and especially liberal in his gifts to the Vatican library; the worthy Pontiff who honored the learned Regiomontanus, and raised him to the episcopacy for his virtues and scientific works, and who summoned him and other learned men to Rome to reform the calendar.

Other editions of Ptolemy were issued in Rome in 1490, and in 1507, the last with a Greek text as well as a Latin version. These successive editions, with maps showing the progress of discovery, form now a series of incalculable value in geographical study. Special maps and accounts of voyages, many of which have perished, were here embodied, and where traditions would be questionable in many cases but for the support afforded by these works.¹

While geography was thus cultivated and encouraged at Rome by the Popes, it had become the study of many natives of the peninsula, and no country ever showed so many men skilled in navigation by actual experience, by study, and by the thorough possession of the geographical data then known. Italian pilots were to be found in all maritime countries, their superior intelligence, learning, and skill putting them so far beyond the local pilots that jealousy was apparently never excited. Even Portugal, which had taken the lead, owed the discovery of the Cape Verde Islands, in 1449, to the Genoese, Antonio Nolli, opening the way towards the Cape of Good Hope in 1486.

The religious idea in its most exalted form influenced the whole character and whole career of Christopher Columbus. Navigator, used to the sea, and to a life amid rough, hardy men, he was a profound student, yet not so immersed in science as to lose sight of the "one thing necessary," and in him this was not merely his own salvation, but in his full religious heart the salvation of millions. His very name seemed to him a command to bear Christ to the nations.

He never felt science so absorb his mind as to make him forgetful of God. He never had, like Bishop Walmesley, to put aside his mathematical studies because they made him oblivious to all else before the very altar of God.

He was too reverent in spirit, too deeply religious, to use his

¹ As indications of the fostering care of the Popes for this study, we may note that Pope Pius II. sent to the Republic of Sienna a copy of Ptolemy, and a map of the world painted on canvas, and that his nephew, Francis Piccolomini, Archbishop of Sienna, by his will of October 29th, 1479, left to the sacristy of his cathedral a Ptolemy and a map on canvas by the cosmographer, Anthony Leonardi, a Venetian priest.

studies to weaken the faith of the unlearned or throw doubt on the inspired word. We know many of the authors whom he studied, and he doubtless bore with him for use the Ephemerides, prepared and printed by the learned Bishop John Muller, better known as Regiomontanus.

When the world seemed combined against him, he found in the convent of our Lady of Rabida, and in a plain Franciscan friar, the weak things that were to confound the strong. The Church is so identified with the spirit and the work of Columbus that even on the bronze doors of our Capitol, justice compelled them to introduce the Franciscan Father Marchena as the great advocate of Columbus.

When passing the Saragossa Sea and the wide Atlantic, Columbus finally descried land from his vessel, whose name he had changed to St. Mary, it never entered his mind to give it any mere human name; he styled the new-found land "San Salvador," land of that Holy Saviour whom it was his mission to bear to unknown shores, and kneeling he pronounced a prayer, itself a token of the religious spirit that animated him in his project: "*Domine Deus aeterni et omnipotens, sacro tuo verbo cælum et terram et mare creasti: benedicatur et glorificetur nomen tuum, laudetur tua Majestas, quæ dignata est per humilem servum tuum, ut ejus sacrum nomen agnoscatur et prædicetur in hac altera mundi parte.*"

When Columbus returned to Spain the account of his wonderful discovery was transmitted without delay to Rome, as though it were an established rule to deposit such evidences at the feet of the Sovereign Pontiff. The Roman press at once gave the account to the world, and though American book-lovers vying with each other to secure copies of these wonderfully rare little volumes, contend which of the various almost identical editions is to be considered the first that announced to the world the wonderful voyage of the Christ-bearer, they all agree that at least four editions of it were printed at Rome by Stephanus Plannck in the autumn of 1493. A New York library, rich beyond all dreams of book-hunters, possesses a copy of each of these wonderfully-rare little books, proofs of Rome's interest in geographical science.

Nor should it be forgotten that Italy of the Popes, alone printed accounts of the second and fourth voyages of the discoverer of the New World. The *De insulis meridiani atq. Indici maris nuper inventis*, of Scyllacius, 1494, and *Copia de la Lettera per Colombo mandata a li serenissimi Re et Regina di Spagna: de le insule et luoghi per lui trouate*. Venice, 1505.

Truly of this period does Thomassy say: "As to the Papacy, last support of Italy, whose pristine grandeur it still perpetuates, she made it in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the general reposi-

tory of ancient and modern science. The ecclesiastical calculations, which finally took shape in the Gregorian reform of the calendar, rendered astronomy popular there with the clergy, and with astronomy and mathematics raised to the highest honors, the study of time and space, chronology and geography."

The discovery of America came to these students, already versed in the actual geographical knowledge, with a full conception of its immense importance for science and religion, for commerce, and for humanity.

Spain and Portugal, then rivals on the ocean, would have made future discoveries a motive for war had not the Pope interposed, and like his predecessor drawn a line of demarcation between the rival states. A line from pole to pole between the Azores and the Cape de Verde Islands first divided the earth into two hemispheres.

As the extent of the new discovery became apparent the division made by a Pope was accepted by science, and in the fourth edition of Ptolemy, issued at Rome in 1508, by Fabricius de Varano, Bishop of Camerino, the Celestine Mark Beneventanus, and John Cotta, of Verona, and dedicated to Robert, Cardinal of St. Anastasia (remarkable too as having from Julius II. a special privilege to the publisher for a period of years, the first instance of protection to literary property), appears John Ruysch's Map of the World in hemispheres, the first of the kind ever issued.

The very geographies used by our children in schools show unwittingly in their opening pages the influence of the Popes in this branch of human knowledge, as the division into hemispheres originated with a Pope, and the first map of the world so drawn was issued at Rome with peculiar privileges from a Pope, dedicated to a cardinal, and edited by a Catholic bishop and a monk.

All the countries on the Atlantic seaboard now sent their vessels across the ocean; the hardy fishermen began, or perhaps but continued, their unrecorded voyages across the wide expanse of ocean to the rich codfisheries off Newfoundland. An activity unprecedented in human annals was seen, but leading the vessels of all nations we behold navigators from Italy of the Popes, the Colons, Vespucci, Cabotos, Verazzanis.

A religious influence pervaded all the explorers. They went forth with the Calendar of the Church in their hands and ever in their thoughts. In a few years the coast line on the expanding map of the New World read like a martyrology. As the Catholic navigator struck the coast he named his landfall after the feast or saint commemorated by the Church on that day. Then as he sailed on day by day he named from the calendar the capes, rivers, bays, and mountains that he discovered. Yielding to the spirit of the Church he rendered a service to science. Had he given the names.

of the men of his own land famous for good or evil, had he transferred to the New World the names of localities in the Old, these names would have told nothing to future times. Using the calendar, he made each name a monumental date. His original narrative, his original chart might perish, but we could still read his course on the maps. The maps and letters of Estevan Gomez have been lost, yet in the earliest map compiled after his discovery, that of Ribero, preserved at Rome, we can, by the help of the calendar, read on the coast distinctly where he reached it, the direction he took along it, and where he left it.

The Gulf of St. Lawrence bears that name because the pious Cartier discovered it on the 10th of August, the feast of the holy Roman deacon. St. Augustine received that title to commemorate the fact that Melendez reached the coast of Florida on the 28th of August, the feast of the holy Bishop of Hippo.

So absolute was the custom that in the warm discussion now going on among American scholars as to the authenticity of the letters and map attributing discoveries on our own coast to the corsair Verrazzano, his neglect to conform to the usual custom is brought forward as an argument against the alleged voyage.

"It was the uniform practice," says one of these writers, "of the Catholic navigators of that early period, among whom, according to the import of the letter, Verrazzano was one, to designate the places discovered by them, by the names of the saints whose feasts were observed on the days they were discovered, or of the festivals of the Church celebrated on those days; 'so that,' says Oviedo, 'it is possible to trace the course of any such explorer along a new coast by means of the Church calendar.'"¹

With these vessels thus religiously guided went priests, and soon after bishops, missionaries of the secular clergy, and of the religious orders, and many of them rendered direct service to geographical science, while thousands contributed more indirectly. In the developed field of activity the clergy became and long remained in Catholic countries directors of the schools of hydrography and navigation, maintained by government for the training of duly qualified pilots and navigators.²

It is common with a shallow class of our writers to laud New England in comparison with New France under a literary point of view, but it is only a piece of audacity to cover up a real case of weakness. New England during its colonial days produced no

¹ Henry C. Murphy, *The Voyage of Verrazzano*, p. 46. Unaware of Oviedo's remarks, the writer years ago directed the attention of some of our historical writers to this means of following the course of explorers.

² See for example in the *Annals of Dieppe* the numbers of priests connected with the school of navigation as directors.

scientific or purely literary work, and in this respect has really nothing to boast of. Quebec had her school of hydrography, directed by learned Jesuits or learned laymen, and the elaborate maps of our whole northern and western country still extant, from the hands of men formed in or directing that school, contrast with the utter poverty of New England in chartography. In fact the earliest and best charts of New England coasts and harbors are those of Champlain, formed to his profession in the schools of Catholic France. And Canada was in the study of botany and natural sciences always in advance of New England.¹

The Church's contributions to geography began early. Gherardini, first bishop of San Domingo, wrote an *Itinerary of the New World*, and missionaries sent from all parts descriptions of new lands and nations, rivers and mountains, with charts, sailing directions, routiers. As the vast extent became more evident, the solitary missionary, mapping his field of labor, asked that a bishop be sent with clergy to occupy the field.

That reports of missionaries and of explorers were sought for and sent to Rome we have abundant evidence. Pope Clement VII. requested that the maps of Gomez should be sent him in order to keep him informed of the latest discoveries,² and Ribero's map of 1529 bears the arms of that Pontiff. The information obtained was at this period in Italy embodied again in mural maps and in globes.

Globes and maps of the world due to the Popes are constantly referred to. Ptolemy was the starting-point of Vatican chartography, as we have seen, but the Popes were prompt in collecting all the scientific elements, says Thomassy, to control and rectify the ideas of antiquity and of the middle ages; and never had the world seen such a centre of geographical information as the Popes enjoyed. Geographical truth reached them from all parts of the globe, and with the establishment of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide and the college which emanated at once from that idea, the reports systematized the information gathered in every country. Negro, Arab, Hindoo, Chinese, and Japanese, formed to European science as well as to Christian erudition and divinity, in the capital of the world, went forth to illumine their own lands with the vivifying principles of the faith, and while laboring to convert and civilize their own countrymen, traced scientifically the boundaries, features, productions, and government of their native States, to transmit to

¹ Kalm shows clearly that he found nothing done in New England for its botany, while in the governor and officers of Canada, in the physicians and clergy, he found students and collectors. A hundred years ago there were two special works on Canadian botany, besides Charlevoix's treatise, the writings of Lafitau and Sarrazin.

² Murphy's *Verrazzano*, pp. 124-5.

the See of Peter, with a feeling of national pride, and in order to awaken or keep alive interest in their fields of labor.

Alexander Piccolomini, a cosmographer, mentions in his work, *Della Grandezza della Terra e dell'Acqua* (Venice, 1558), a terrestrial globe in the possession of Cardinal Viseo, and another in the palace of Cardinal Carpi, which showed by a new and ingenious system the altitudes of the mountains (thus really adopting centuries ago a system set up as new in our time). He mentions a still larger one then possessed by Cardinal de Urbino. He expatiates more at length on a large and fine globe, very carefully made, which he saw and examined at Rome in the house of Mgr. James Cocco, of Venice, Archbishop of Corfu, and one of the Fathers of the Council of Trent.

The princes of the Church evidently prided themselves on possessing such globes. They were not mere spheres covered with a printed map, but each was a special work by itself, the result of years of study and collections, embodying all the information acquired by some cosmographer.

Our own country possesses one of these globes, which is invested with special interest. It stands in the library of the New York Historical Society. Amid collections on the Dutch settlement of New Netherland, and publications of New England and other historical societies, relics and mementoes of American worthies, the visitor will find a copper globe in its wooden frame, now dark with age. It gives the maker's name, Euphrosynus Ulpius, and bears this inscription: "Marcello Cervino, S. R. E., Presbytero Cardinali, D. D., Romae," showing that it once belonged to that cardinal, who became Pope, and alone for many centuries preserved his name in the Papacy, ruling the Church as Pope Marcellus II. The globe is forty-two inches in circumference, the outlines of coast graven in the copper, the names apparently punched in letter by letter. It was made in 1542, thus antedating all the settlements on our coast, even that of St. Augustine, and is almost coeval with the last voyage of Cartier. It lays down the discoveries of Verrazzano, and is the earliest monument in favor of their authenticity, but leaves blank the date, showing that the conscientious maker failed to obtain positive information on the point.

Such were the globes showing the latest discoveries that cardinals in the sixteenth century were proud of having in their homes, and we may well assert that no city in Europe at the time could have produced such a number of valuable compendiums of geographical knowledge.

But these are not the only proofs of the interest felt at Rome. We have already mentioned the mural maps of the Popes. These were never abandoned. Above the Loggia of Raphael, on the

third floor of the great court of the Vatican, are the galleries devoted to this science. The first owes its present decorations to Pope Pius IV.; the second was completed by Pope Gregory XIII.

On the walls are maps taken from the latest editions of Ptolemy, painted in 1549 and 1566, and embracing the discoveries recorded in Ruscelli's first edition in Italian, issued in 1561. At the clock at the extremity of the first gallery are the British Isles, England, Scotland, and Ireland; then Spain, France, Italy, Greece, Asia Minor, India, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Scandinavia, Muscovy, Scythia, or Tartary; closing with Greenland, which, first dependent on the see of Hamburg, had for some centuries its resident bishops, dwelling at Garda, where recent explorations have traced the ruins of the Cathedral.

Between the maps are views of Rome and Venice, and a view of the Council of Trent. All this was executed by Piero Ligorio, under the pontificate of Pius IV.

Under Pope Gregory XIII., the father of modern science, the Reformer of the Calendar, were added maps of Africa, in two parts; the kingdom of Tombotu (Timbuctoo), and of Abyssinia, being the two divisions of that day. Below West Africa, in an oblong border, are three paintings of cities, Senega, lignea civitas portatilis (Senega, a portable wooden city); Fessa nova civitas, Fessa vetus, Mauritaniæ urbs regina (New Fessa, Old Fessa, queen city of Mauritania).

Under Abyssinia is shown Mount Amara and three cities, one being Cassumum, city of Queen Candace.

At the third portico began maps of Turkey, Egypt, Arabia Felix, and views of three cities; Muscovy, Persia, Cathay (China), India, within and beyond the Ganges, with a map of Zeylam (Ceylon). This map has been much injured by rains, that have penetrated the roof. Then follow China, Tartary, Japan, America, the Archipelago of St. Domingo, and a recent and very full account of New Spain. Other maps, now much injured by time and weather, next meet the eye, and at least one of the islands near the first meridian, in which St. Brendan's Island is laid down, with a nearer approach to truth than is usually seen, as Iceland.

The first series of maps are on Ptolemy's system of spherical projection; but the others are on plain projection, the latitude and longitude being carefully laid down, for these maps were all the work of scientific men.

The explorations of Dr. Livingstone in our time have attracted the attention of the world, yet on the map of Egypt, painted three hundred years ago, in the Vatican, the east branch of the Nile rises in Lake Zambesi. The kingdom of Tombotu (Timbuctoo) occupies the valley of the Niger, showing that knowledge was possessed

at Rome, which the rest of Europe ignored till this century put it too clear to doubt.

The map of America gives all the Northeast as New France, and calls the ocean around Newfoundland "Sea of New France." Tierra del Fuego appears as part of a great southern continent.

The Gallery of Pius IV. was faithfully restored in 1583 by Pope Gregory XIII., who also had another gallery, now known as the Gregorian Promenade, painted with the provinces of Italy in detail, and adorned with paintings of scenes in Italian history, ancient and modern, among which, as one of the glories of the peninsula, Columbus is shown in a triumphal chariot on the sea. The paintings were executed by Tempesta, Romanelli, and other painters of eminence. This gallery was restored in 1631 by Pope Urban VIII., but with so little judgment that the added colors turned black. Pope Pius IX., amid all the important cares of his wonderful pontificate, thought even of these geographical glories of his predecessors, and, correcting the error, has had the second coat removed and the restoration properly done by Bianchini, fully in the spirit of the original work.

These mural maps have not been mere curiosities of the past, but embodying information contained sometimes in local maps that have perished, have frequently been decisive in controverted points.

Many of the noted cosmographers have been priests, but for exalted position and extent of geographical labors we will take but one, the Very Reverend Father Mark Vincent Coronelli, General of the Order of Minims, or religious of the order of St. Francis de Paula. He was a native of Venice, cosmographer of that commercial republic, and renowned for his public lectures on geography. He issued no less than four hundred maps, which were so highly esteemed, and won him so widespread a reputation, that Cardinal d'Estrées induced him to make for King Louis XIV. of France two immense globes, each twelve feet in diameter, for the royal library. They received the approbation of scientific men of that day for their superiority. Coronelli, to perpetuate his work, founded at Venice an Academy of Cosmography. He became General of his Order in 1702, and died in his native city in 1718.

The new Catholic missions throughout the world—into which the recently-formed Society of Jesus entered with heroic zeal—had become so multiplied and so vast that the Sovereign Pontiff Gregory XV. created a special congregation, called *De Propaganda Fide*, to which was specially committed the direction of all the missions of the Church in countries where Catholicity and Christianity were not the prevailing religion. To this was soon united that great university for pupils from all nations of the universe, the Urban College. A new impulse was given to the apostolical laborers

throughout the world, new missions were formed, new bodies rose to carry on the evangelical work in fields still white for the harvest, seminaries of foreign missions were established in various ports, and a new spirit awakened which culminated in our century in the organization of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, in which the Catholic millions, giving their slight offerings, have made so much good practicable by the devoted missionaries in all lands. The Propaganda at Rome, by the very force of circumstances, became a great centre of geographical information, and among the Cardinal Protectors have been many whose names are familiar to geographical students as patrons of science.

The Propaganda became a centre not only for information from all parts, and naturally a depository of maps, charts, and globes, but by the establishment of a printing press, where type of a vast number of languages were cut and cast, it became a centre of linguistic science, one of the greatest helps to accurate and certain geographical and ethnographical knowledge.

The missionaries in all parts of the world studied the languages of the peoples to whom they were sent. Where no grammars or dictionaries existed they set to work to prepare them; always under great disadvantages and seldom with the leisure required for thorough work at first, or the means of comparison and dialectic study, but these were almost always followed by more solid works, or if no opportunity was afforded, the original elementary essays stand in many cases as our only monuments of extinct languages. Rome became the depository of immense numbers of these works, and priests of the Catholic Church were the first to point out language as the surest test in establishing the relationship of the various tribes of the earth, and the true means of grouping them into families.

To learn to what extent the Catholic Church has contributed in this field, it is enough to take a work like Ludewig's *Literature of American Aboriginal Languages*. If we omit the mere vocabularies of limited length taken down by travellers, the great mass of what can properly be called dictionaries and grammars are the work of Catholic missionaries. In this country we find even in New England that the dictionary of the Abenaki, prepared by the martyred Father Rale, is the most extensive one of any New England dialect. New York shows no grammar or dictionary except those from the pens of Catholic missionaries. Of the Indians of Maryland the only known grammar is one still in manuscript at Rome, prepared by Father Andrew White; a grammar of the Timuquana language of Florida was written by Father Pareja. The Wyandots, who once had a village at Sandusky, and gave it its name, had their language reduced to grammatical form by Fathers Chaumonot and Potier,

and a dictionary compiled by the Franciscan Brother Sagard. The only monument of the Illinois is Father Le Boulanger's dictionary. In our time Bishop Baraga published a grammar and dictionary of the Ojibwe; and Rev. Mr. Belcourt another grammar. The California languages found lexicographers and grammarians in Fathers Sitjar, Arroyo de la Cuesta, and other Franciscans.

The Church was not only the first in thus collecting material, but the first to show its scientific importance by classifying, comparing, and reducing to families the various known dialects. The pioneer in this was the priest Lorenzo Hervas, till its suppression a member of the Society of Jesus, who aided by missionaries of that society, gathering at Rome from all parts after the storm of infidelity uprooted their mission work, prepared his "Catalogo delle Lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinitá e diversitá," and other general linguistic works, in his vast treatise, *Idea dell' Universo*. He was the pioneer, and Adelung and Vater but followed in the path traced out by the learned Catholic priest, whose sound judgment is as fully admitted by writers of our day as his immense industry and varied learning.

The Church may claim this great branch as peculiarly her own, from the vast collection of material by her missionaries, and from the first scientific arrangement made by one of her priests in the Roman States and under the protection of the Pope.

The maps of early date collected by the Propaganda are numerous and valuable. Thomassy describes at length fifteen of remarkable importance. Two of these, the Verrazzani and the Ribero maps, printed in the recent controversy as to John Verrazzani, are constantly referred to on both sides, the collections of the Propaganda thus furnishing American scholars with the important documents on a contested point of historic American geography.

The library and the museum of the Propaganda are rich in medals, coins, engraved gems and intaglios, paintings and manuscripts from all parts of the world, with much to illustrate the manners, customs, mythology, and rites of various nations, and thus give additional aid to the study of geography. Many Pontiffs and Cardinals have enriched them by precious donations, and the name of Cardinal Borgia will long be numbered among their most judicious benefactors.

Besides the direct reports to the Propaganda, missionaries contributed most valuable and important works, devoted specially to the countries where they labored, and others which, while describing their own evangelical labors, are replete with geographical information which might be sought in vain in the professed geographical works of that day. Of Japan, till within the last few years, all that was really known was what was described by the Catholic missionaries. The same was the case with China, and is now of Corea.

Only a few years ago the work of two Catholic missionaries on Chinese Tartary and Thibet was translated into all languages, and gave the first detailed information of their present state. Relations of separate missions, the *Lettres Edifiantes*, *The Annals of the Propagation of the Faith*, give an immense mass of authentic material as to the less known parts of Asia, Africa, and Oceanica.

As to America, from its discovery to the year 1600, the material is almost exclusively Catholic. For the next century the Church supplies, so far as exploration and geography are concerned, the most important part.

The philosophical historian, Bancroft, says of the Jesuit missionaries, in words so often quoted, that it seems almost useless to cite them here: "The history of their labors is connected with the origin of every celebrated town in the annals of French America; not a cape was turned, nor a river entered, but a Jesuit led the way." But even he is contracted in his view, as is Parkman in styling his work, *The Jesuits in North America*, when, in fact, he treats only of the Jesuits in part of the diocese of Quebec, not even a whole diocese, much less a continent. Men accustomed to churches whose dogmas are received only in a country or a state, get their ideas cramped; it needs Catholicity to expand the chest and thought so as to embrace a world.

The Jesuits were not alone, nor were their labors confined to French explorations. The Franciscan Father Mark, from sunny Nice, penetrated to New Mexico in 1539; two of the same order followed, bearing the cross to perish. Others followed, exploring and christianizing, so that Father Martin Ignatius, before the close of the century, in his *Itinerary of the New World*, describes an overland route through New Mexico; and in the next century explorations were pushed from it in all directions. The Dominican Andrew de Olmos penetrated to Texas in 1544; three years later Luis Cancer, of the same order, died in what would seem a wild attempt to penetrate into Florida and convert its fierce people, did we not know that he had already, alone, and with nothing but his crucifix, won the natives of a part so hostile that Spaniards called it Land of War, till his peaceful conquest gave it the name of Land of Peace. If Jesuits bedewed the banks of the Rappahannock with their blood, Dominicans had already explored the Chesapeake and reared the altar and the cross, all seeking the route to China. Carmelites explored the coast of California before Jesuit, Franciscan, and Dominican began their labors there; and in the expeditions through the valleys of the Gila and Colorado the names of Jesuits and Franciscans mingle, Kühn, Salvatierra, Font, and Garces.

The honor of penetrating to the interior of our territory divides among all the missionary orders, the secular clergy, and the bishops.

Benedictines accompany Cartier, and ascend the St. Lawrence. The Franciscan Caron penetrates to Lake Huron; the Jesuit Jogues to Lake Superior, Lake George, and the Mohawk; Dreuillettes and Albanel to Hudson Bay and the mouth of the Kennebec; the Franciscan de la Roche to lands east of Niagara; Allouez, a Jesuit, studies the tides of Green Bay; his fellow-missionary, Marquette, descends the Mississippi till he decides into what waters it must empty, and draws a map of its course, and the nations lying upon it; the Franciscan Hennepin follows, exploring the river to the Falls he named in honor of St. Anthony of Padua, as his fellow-missionaries had bestowed the name of the foundress of the second order on Lake St. Clare. The Jesuit Rafeix prepares numerous maps of countries on the lakes; the Sampson-like Dollier de Casson and his fellow-Sulpitian, Galinée, map Lake Erie. At a later date Father Aubry dies near the Lake of the Woods, as he seeks to penetrate to the Pacific; and a Spanish Franciscan from New Mexico meets a like fate near the Missouri, while pushing on his course of exploration and missions. At the South we find Laval and Siguenza, Jesuits of rival nations, both scientific men, exploring the northern shores of the Gulf. The missionary explorers were of all religious orders, and also from the ranks of the secular clergy.

Their maps, their statements, were adopted by cosmographers, and where, as in the case of California, prejudice induced men to discard the knowledge acquired by Jesuit missionaries, we now in turn laugh at the men who made Lower California an island, rather than follow the Jesuits whose actual experience convinced them that it was only a peninsula.

The near approach of America and Asia in the north was first argued by the Jesuit Father Grelon, who, after laboring among the Hurons on their lake, afterwards met in Chinese Tartary a woman of his former flock who had been sold from tribe to tribe till she reached Asia. From China he wrote to the learned societies of France his theory, based on this, that the two continents either joined or approached very closely in the north.

Our modern missionaries have done much in Africa, Oceanica, and even in America, exploring our western country, and still more the northern parts of British America, where they have pushed their missions to the shores of the Arctic Ocean.

The information acquired by these early missionaries, whose labors were aided by no expensive array of scientific apparatus, show how much can be accomplished by thoroughly trained men, of practical ability.

Their works, like the Jesuit *Relations* of Canada, teem with information, full even to minute detail, as to the life, ideas, habits in war and peace, progress and character of the Indians; as well as to

geography properly, the animal, vegetable, and mineral resources of the country. Catholic missionaries first called attention to the coal-mines of Nova Scotia, the salt springs of New York, the oil springs of Pennsylvania, the copper of Lake Superior, to the ginseng so prized in China, introduced in Europe the Jesuit's bark (quinine), as they were the first in the North and West to make wine, plant European grains and fruit, and in the South introduced the sugar-cane, olive, and European grape, and the orange, a fruit which even Europe owed to missionaries.

Of professed works on different American States the Church can show a host from the pens of her missionary and other clergy. Brother Sagard's *History of Canada*; Charlevoix's *Histories of New France, St. Domingo, and Paraguay*; Du Tertre's *Antilles*; Clavigero's *Mexico and California*; Morfi's *Texas and New Mexico*; Venega's and Begert's *California*; Molina's *Chili*; Muratori's *Paraguay*; Faulkener's *Patagonia*; Dobrizhoffer's *Abipones*; and in our day, Ferland's *History of Canada*, and the *History and Biographical Works* of the Abbé Faillon; all works full of geographical and historical details, rendering them books of recognized value.

From what the Church has done for the geography, and with it for the history, antiquities, and ethnology of America, we can infer what she has done for these sciences throughout the world, for she can truly say: "Quæ regio in terris nostri non plena laboris."

The Church is of all nations. The synagogue was but of one. The Church with its head at Rome speaks *Urbi et Orbi*—to the city and to the world; and her utterances are listened to by the faithful under every sky and in every land. Geography is but a description of her field of labor. The sects are limited to isolated parts. None can like the Church number whole nations and thousands in every nation. They are but local, while she is universal; and, placing on the walls of the palace where her Sovereign Pontiff lives in all simplicity, the map of the whole world, she but places there the various countries from whose episcopal sees the bishops will come at the call of the successor of St. Peter, to sit in such *Œcumene*ical Councils as she only can assemble.

If the Popes have rendered such service to geographical science, directly and indirectly, by inspiring her sons to study and perfect it, by collecting, preserving, by publishing and encouraging, they have but mapped out the field of their own mighty labors, the extent of the care devolved on the high priest of Christendom. Whether in prosperity or in adversity, reigning in splendor or a prisoner, with the rulers of Europe respecting or gainsaying him, the Pope is still the only being on earth whose realm is coextensive with the surface of the globe; who can look on the map of the whole world and feel that he has in every part hearts devoted to him.

THE PAST AND THE PRESENT INDISSOLUBLY
UNITED IN RELIGION.

GENTILISM, OR RELIGION PREVIOUS TO CHRISTIANITY, AND THE INSEPARABLE CONNECTION OF ITS TRUE STUDY AND KNOWLEDGE WITH THE EXISTING WORK OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Gentilism: Religion previous to Christianity. By the Rev. Aug. J. Thébaud, S. J. New York. D. & J. Sadlier & Co.

IF the great Apostle of the nations of the earth could be supposed to be permitted to revisit the scene of his labors, on purpose to continue his former apostolic ministry among the nations, his exclamation on surveying the vast North American Continent would surely be: *A great door is open to me and there are many gainsayers* (1 Cor. xvi. 9). It is not, we may rest perfectly assured, without a most intimate connection with the destinies of the Christian religion that the Almighty Ruler of the earth, which He has created and peopled with living souls, to whom He has revealed a destiny beyond this present life, is causing such multitudes of these souls to break up their homes in the Old World of Europe in order to transfer themselves to the New World, there to begin life afresh by seeking a new domicile and a new citizenship. Not a sparrow falls to the ground, says Jesus Christ, without your Heavenly Father (Matt. x. 29). How much more then must the growth of an entire new world arising out of the spoils of the old Christian populations of Europe be looked upon as a special marvel due to the direct action of the providence of God. Here, we must unquestionably say, is the finger of God. Of a truth, here is the work of God, and it is marvellous in our eyes.

But God is never to be understood to do anything in vain and without a set and deliberate purpose. All His works, says the Psalmist, are done in wisdom (Ps. ciii. 24); and His apostle at the council in Jerusalem declares "known unto God from the beginning are all His works" (Acts xv. 18). Yet although the works of God are unquestionably well known to Himself, to us it must always be becoming to exclaim, "Quam investigabiles viae ejus!" All undue presumption then being disclaimed, as if we could in any sense pretend to be privileged interpreters of the counsels of God, two points, nevertheless, present themselves, as meriting in a very high degree the careful study of all who desire to discover the Christian reasons for the marvellous phenomenon that is daily being carried forward to its accomplishment, in the building up of

a new world out of the ruins and *débris* of the formerly Christian nations of old Europe.

Simultaneously with this daily growth and formation of the New World, we cannot fail to notice that the civil governments of the European nations are beginning to give continually stronger proofs of their settled and deliberate design formally to constitute their political society in complete atheism. This atheism, indeed, appears to be a simple political necessity of the modern civil state, for the reason that the modern statesmen hold a complete unity within their particular territory to be the political "summum bonum," which must be realized no matter at what cost. Not that we are to be so simple as to believe that this unity is sought for by them merely for unity's sake. Unity within their own territory is sought for only as a means to an end; and this end is the complete and entire subordination of the individual citizen to the ends and aims, whatever these may be, of the civil state. To the statesman of the modern school, the citizen first begins to arrive at the true summit of his citizenship when he has surrendered himself into the hands of the statesman, as a being, without a will, without a mind, without a conscience, and without a religion. If the citizen is to be allowed to have a will of his own, whenever it happens that the modern state seeks its natural end, which is aggrandizement by conquest, the individual citizen would be able to object to quitting his employments in order to join the ranks of the army and shoulder a musket; he would also be able to refuse to pauperize himself and his family to supply the sinews of war for a conquest in which he has neither interest nor sympathy. Again, if the citizen is to be allowed to have a mind, he may make a very dangerous use of it in criticizing the acts of the state. Still less can it be tolerated that he should have a conscience, for in this case he may be so intolerably perverse as to say, "Here is a law that I cannot possibly obey, because it contradicts the plainly revealed will and law of God." And lastly, least of all can it be endured that he should have a religion, for then he would be in danger of having a desire to give himself over to the Roman Catholic Church, in which case the statesman's indispensable "summum bonum" of perfect unity within the national territory becomes most criminally trampled under foot.

Since, then, the modern statesman requires as the perfection of the "status" of civil citizenship under his rule, that the individual citizen of the state should acknowledge himself, in practice at least, not a man at all, but a simple thing or chattel of the state—that is to say, a being without will, without mind, without conscience, and without religion, what is more obvious than the inexorable necessity, which from the nature of the case is incumbent upon all

statesmen who hold these ideas of what the civil state ought to be, of bending their every effort to constitute political society on the basis of the plain and undisguised denial of the existence of God, who is the Supreme Ruler and Judge of all men? Without an openly avowed basis of pure atheism the state as constituted by modern statesmen cannot hope to exist, at least not to exist without serious disturbance. It is set up against God and independently of Him, and consequently it must necessarily have God for its adversary.

It would seem that the Divine providence of the Supreme Ruler of the earth, who never fails to watch over the world that He has made, and respecting whom His apostle delivers the very significant warning, "Do not be deceived; God is not mocked" (Gal. vi. 7), in order to baffle and frustrate the designs of the statesmen who are bent upon constituting their political society on a basis of simple and pure atheism, is forming a new world on a new continent, and inspiring the population of the countries where this atheism is in progress, with a kind of instinct that leads them to break up their homes in the Old World, and fly to the freedom and welcome that awaits them in the New World. It is naturally not without a struggle that the final resolve to quit the old homes of what once was Christian Europe is made. But the conviction that to have to sink down into the condition of a mere thing of the state, and to have to become a mere being, without a will, without a mind, without a conscience, and without a religion, is far too great a price to pay for a home in an old country, when there is a home to be gained in another land across the seas, where the dignity of man is recognized, is certain in the end to become the stronger and to prevail. In simple truth "God is not mocked," and it is thus that the New World daily profits by the means which God takes to baffle the designs of the new class of *robusti venatores contra Dominum*, the infidel statesmen of the old European nations, who are using the powers of the state intrusted to them against the God from whom they have received them. In a like manner also it would seem that God is also providing for the safety and well-being of His Church. He is dividing it into two companies, on the pattern of Jacob's caution and wariness when he was preparing for the encounter with his brother Esau. Being greatly afraid on hearing that Esau was coming with four hundred men to meet him, Jacob divided his people into two companies, saying, "If Esau should come and strike one company, the other which remains will be saved" (Gen. xxxii. 8). Side by side with the Old World of Europe, Christian now no longer, except in the memories of the past, and in the still great multitude of the Christian people who cover its soil, there stands the New World, Christian in its

name and all the more certainly Christian in its hopes for the future, for the very reason that it has continually before its eyes the wreck, the misery, and the ruin of the Old World, from which it may take a timely warning, and may daily learn from all it sees there not to follow on in the same path.

The New World, however, this second company of Jacob's household, continues, as we have said, to receive an almost daily afflux of those to whom the mercy of God opens a way of escape from the continually increasing decay of the Christian cause and the consequent proportionate growth of state-thralldom in old Europe. While, therefore, on the one hand, the wisdom and the mercy of God manifest themselves in providing the means of escape, there is a corresponding danger on the other hand from which the New World, whither the escape takes place, will do well to guard itself. God would never have given over His Christian people of the Old World into the hands of the atheist statesmen, who are become their oppressors, had the Christian people themselves, by their own shortcomings and transgressions, not placed themselves in the grasp and under the power of their oppressors. It is in human nature to accommodate itself to that in the midst of which it finds itself. There is a continual process of acclimatization going on in the world of the spiritual as well as of the physical man. And as there is even yet such a weird charm in the feeling of home and in the old Christian traditions of Europe, who can wonder if its populations are necessarily strongly predisposed to bear with a very great deal, indeed, from their new masters, and to a wonderful extent to shut their eyes to the real growth of the atheist and infidel power under whose grasp they are, nevertheless, slowly and surely falling.

The danger then is, lest this deplorable characteristic of the Catholicity of old Europe, which, under the influence of numerous quite intelligible motives, is perpetually saying to itself peace when there is no peace, no, not even the shadow of a possibility of any peace, should spread and extend itself in the New World. Were this to be the case the really great Christian hopes for the future, which are the good gift of God to the New World, might come to suffer equally from a cause which is now on its way utterly and totally to ruin all that yet remains intact of the Christian prospects of the Old World.

What this fascination is in the Old World, and what its effect upon its victims really is, is scarcely to be understood by those in the Old World who, with their own consent, have suffered themselves to become its willing and, to all appearance, perfectly satisfied adherents. It may, however, be unmistakably understood by those who, to their own most fortunate and auspicious warning,

have the opportunity put in their way to look on and study its workings from a distance. It is with extreme difficulty, as I have said, that the working of the fascination can be understood by those whose lot is cast in the midst of it. Nevertheless, that it is not impossible to live in the midst of it, and notwithstanding to be fully and keenly alive to the ruinous way in which it works, I may cite the following passage from an extremely remarkable letter publicly addressed by a priest of the Archdiocese of Westminster to one of the London Catholic weekly journals, whose circulation is quite quadruple that of any other, signed by his name and address, and bearing the date April 29th of the current year. The letter is all the more remarkable as a piece of evidence, because the writer is extremely well known for his zeal and his literary attainments, and among the persons to whom his words apply, with the single exception of their surrender to the fascination in question, which the writer combats, are many names of those who are widely known as being foremost in the active advancement of every good work, and who in every other respect merit nothing but universal gratitude and affection. If space permitted the whole letter to be quoted it would well repay perusal, but I must be content with the following extract as sufficient for my purpose :

“The citadel of Christian education has been already taken, in establishing the decisive principle, that elementary education should be nothing more than what a secular state could take in hand. But the representatives (laymen) of the Catholic body have never cared to protest anything openly to the contrary. The Catholics of the country are those whose interests are more concerned than those of any other body, but instead of being foremost in the defence of them they are only singular in their apathetic neglect, acting only as if they had nothing to do with it. The house of Christian education is nearly burnt down to the ground; the Catholic leaders take no more notice of it than if it was a change taking place among the Buddhists in Thibet. There has actually been no indication that they are aware of the existence of any destruction except in their being willing to send in representative people to see that it goes on uninterruptedly.”

The writer concludes his letter with the following sentence :

“If after this any sanguine Catholic should venture to indulge a hope that the Catholic Union is going to promote the cause of Christian education by any effort of speech within their power, in the way of pledge or warning or encouragement, he might as well disabuse himself of such an idea.”

Words of this kind, dispassionately uttered by one perfectly able to weigh their value, and fully cognizant of the reason of conscience which impels him to utter them, conclusively point to the existence of a fascination and a spell, which links the Catholics of the Old World to an antichristian principle, without their appearing to be able to penetrate the nature of the deception by which they are bound. And hence the wisdom and mercy of God especially

shines forth in this very point, that in our century He has been pleased to divide His people between an old and a new world, so that if Esau is able to fall upon and to lead captive the one company, the other may be able to escape him.

These preliminary remarks have been indispensable to an adequate introduction of our subject, and to exhibit in its just light the true and real nature of the invaluable service which Father Aug. Thébaud has rendered to the cause of the Catholic religion by his recent volume, *Gentilism, or Religion previous to Christianity*. That such a work should have first seen the light in the New World, and have consequently been the product of Catholic thought in that part of Jacob's household, which by the special mercy of God is most removed from the reach of the modern Esau's influence, is quite as much a thing in the order of Divine providence, as it is according to a certain natural order of things, that its first reception in that part of the household which is more immediately under the spell should have been marked by something nearly approaching to a complete failure to perceive and appreciate the intimate relation of the argument with and its profound importance to the present well-being of the truths of the Catholic faith. These truths of the Catholic faith are of course one and the same for all times, ("Veritas Domini manet in æternum,") but the Old and the New World are, notwithstanding, very differently circumstanced with reference to them. The Catholics of the Old World have not as yet to any great extent opened their eyes to perceive the truth that the reign of Antichrist has come upon them. They are like men whose whole fortune has been for a long time embarked in a bank which they have supposed to be inaccessible to danger, but which has unexpectedly become broken; and they are not willing to believe that the bankruptcy has really taken place. Old Europe is still, in so many ways, full of its former Christian traditions that extremely few are willing to believe the terrible truth, that it has formally repudiated its former Christian self and formally inaugurated the reign of Antichrist in several of its various populations. The Catholics of old Europe are prevented from generally perceiving this, for the reason that for the present the reign of Antichrist is held in check by the still powerful multitudes of the Christian people who cover its soil, and who, stirred up and animated as they have now been for many years by the voice of the reigning Sovereign Pontiff, cannot as yet be induced fully to surrender themselves.

The Catholics of the Old World may be thus seen still to lean on their Christian traditions of the past, and it is consequently only with the greatest difficulty that, in a few instances, they are able to come to the startling and painful discovery that these traditions are

now a name and nothing more. Happily for themselves, the Catholics of the New World are not easily able to be under any such similar illusions. I must undoubtedly say happily for themselves, for it is surely infinitely better to stand firm on the open plain, and to be aware of the necessity for throwing up earthworks by honest labor, in order to the needful entrenchment of the position chosen, than to lean upon defences which have no earthly existence except in the vain imaginations of those whose sole possible prospect for the future, is to find themselves cruelly undeceived the first moment the hour of the trial really comes. When the order of the Prussian government came for the closing of the large and important college of the Jesuit fathers at "Maria Laach," and for the expatriation of the fathers themselves, what avail were the ancient Christian traditions of once Catholic Germany, according to which it would seem to have been a simple impossibility that such an order could ever have been given, or if given could ever have been carried into execution. Yet given the order was, and ruthlessly has it been put into execution. The whole of the fathers who formed the inmates of Maria Laach have been scattered over the world:

At nos hinc alii sitientes ibimus Afros;
Pars Scythiam et rapidum Crete veniemus Oaxem,
Et penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.—(VIRG., *Ecl. I.*)

In precisely the same manner, as the reign of Antichrist continues to spread and extend itself to the remaining parts of Europe, of what greater avail will the ancient traditions be there also, as barrier after barrier keeps falling down before the growth of the antichristian power? It is quite otherwise in the New World. The Catholic Church there has scarcely any other choice than to know that her past traditions furnish her little or nothing to lean upon, and that she has to look, so to speak, to that alone which she can call into being around herself. The past, consequently, in the New World can give rise to but few delusive hopes and slender visionary expectations, and it can become the ground of comparatively few illusory prospects that remain to be cruelly dispelled. Spread out before the Catholic Church of the New World lies her work. "A great door," she may say with St. Paul, "is open to me," and there are many adversaries, but then there is at least the "open door," the fair field and no favor, the honest scope for work to be done, a comparative absence of false or vain illusions, in a word, the work of an Apostle in very much more of its truth and simplicity.

In this aspect of affairs, what is the true nature, we have to ask, of the invaluable service rendered by Father Thébaud? Let us pause fairly to take account how the case stands.

The Catholic Church in the New World is in the condition of an Apostle who has to make his way by Apostolic preaching. But the preaching of an Apostle must always presuppose an existing foundation of belief in God in those to whom he comes to preach. The Apostle's message is one that in its nature is not to be addressed to scoffers and infidels, but solely to those who are already in possession of what we may be allowed to describe as a solid existing outfit of the knowledge of God as the true Ruler and Governor of the World and the rewarder of those who seek Him. The words of Christ Himself in which He announced His Gospel to all men are, "You believe in God; believe also in me" (John xiv. 1). And the reason of this becomes evident on a very little reflection. For in what do the glad tidings of the Gospel specially consist except in this, that God, having up to this time been known to rule over His world of men as an Invisible Power, has now entered into His world as a man, and has made Himself familiarly known by a life upon earth, all the chief particulars of which are perfectly recorded, due provision having been made for carrying the knowledge of them over the earth. But then the knowledge of this Gospel, that is, in other words, of these glad tidings that the hitherto Sovereign but Invisible God has become a man, of necessity presupposes the previous knowledge of His prior existence as the Invisible Ruler and Sovereign of the world of men. If there be no such Sovereign Ruler of the world, it is plain there can be no Gospel bearing the glad tidings of His having become a man. The Gospel, therefore, from the very character of the message which it has to deliver, cannot possibly, in the nature of things, be the first revelation of the existence and attributes of the One Creator, Lord and Sovereign of the universe, the knowledge of whom it must necessarily presuppose in all the various hearers to whom it has to be preached.

This truth we see exemplified in the most striking manner in the Acts of the Apostles. The first man from the Gentile world who is brought to the knowledge of the Gospel, is already "a religious man, fearing God with all his house, giving many alms to the people, and continually making his prayer to God" (Acts x. 2). St. Luke, it is to be observed, does not think it necessary, in giving this description of Cornelius, to enter into any particulars to account for the fact of a centurion in the Roman army being such a religious man. Notwithstanding this, were we to follow what the ordinary current of our ideas would prompt us to think, we should have pronounced Cornelius almost necessarily to have been a pagan, and we should have been disposed to assume, almost as a matter of course, that he could, by no possibility, have had any access in paganism to the knowledge of God, and his worship of Him

in his family, which St. Luke certainly describes him as possessing.

The really correct inference, consequently, from the manner in which St. Luke describes Cornelius, must undoubtedly be that though we could not suppose every centurion in the Roman army to be necessarily quite the same as Cornelius, still there was nothing in any way unusually strange or extraordinary in a centurion of the army being such a man as St. Luke describes Cornelius. In a word, there would be nothing more uncommon, according to the tenor of St. Luke's words, in finding a centurion like Cornelius, than it would be to discover now that any particular commissioned officer of the British army, or of that of the United States, was a Roman Catholic. Even if the standard of religion attained to by Cornelius was to some extent exceptionally high, nevertheless what we have to observe is that it was within the reach of the religion of the Roman Empire, which we call paganism, to produce men of the stamp of Cornelius. Such, unquestionably, was the centurion of whom our Lord bore witness "that He had not found such faith as his, no, not in Israel." When we proceed to study with a little minute attention the missionary experience of St. Paul, if we do not generally meet with quite as advanced a type as that of Cornelius as common in the Gentile world, we certainly seldom fail to observe that St. Paul comes across a large and numerous class among the Gentiles, who are called "colentes." These "colentes" are all persons, men and women, who acknowledge and worship One God, and everywhere show a disposition to fraternize with the Hebrews in their synagogues. For example, St. Paul when he is invited to speak to those who have flocked to the Hebrew synagogue in Antioch on the Sabbath day, begins his address: "Ye men of Israel," and then adds, "and *you who fear God*,—listen." Such was the result of his words, that on the following Sabbath nearly the whole city came to hear the Word of God. The final effect of St. Paul's words here was, that all the Gentile people who heard them greatly rejoiced and glorified the Word of the Lord. Yet the whole of St. Paul's discourse is built upon and presupposes the knowledge of God, the recognized and undoubted Lord and Ruler of all men upon the earth, as already in the minds of all his hearers. What St. Paul declares is, not that God exists, for about this no one has the least doubt, but that He has manifested Himself upon earth as a man, and that this man is the Jesus of Nazareth who was put to death under the warrant of Pontius Pilate, outside the city of Jerusalem on the cross, who rose again on the third day, and in whose name henceforward remission of sins and an election to eternal life is everywhere proclaimed. Precisely the same is the case at Athens. There the Apostle is moved in spirit from wit-

nessing the city wholly given up to idolatry. He therefore disputes with such vehemence, on the Christian truths, to the Jews and the “*colentes*” in the forum, that the city at length is moved, and he is brought before the Court of the Areopagus, who assemble to call upon him publicly to give an account of his doctrine. Before this assembly again it has to be observed that St. Paul is able to assume the existence of God, as a perfectly known truth, about which no one will venture to raise a question. He declares boldly: “God who made the world and all things that are in it, seeing that He is the Lord of the earth and the heaven, does not require temples made with hands in order to have a dwelling-place” (Acts xvii. 24). Not a dissentient voice is raised against the Apostle on this truth. It is only when he advances forward to other truths proper to the Christian revelation, and which are new, viz., the future judgment and the resurrection from the dead, that some then begin to manifest their derision, and others to say, “We will hear thee again on this matter at another time.”

A principle that appears thus manifestly characterizing the preaching of an apostle, must of course be one also that possesses its recognized place in the general body of Catholic theology. Undoubtedly this is the case, and were it strictly necessary to our purpose that the assertion should be proved, it would be nothing more than a work of ordinary labor to select and produce the necessary attestations. However, as it may be quite easily seen that this would entail a very unsuitable digression which our limits absolutely refuse to admit, we may, in this respect, take a useful hint from a certain pertinent domestic maxim which our readers may have chanced to hear, and which says, “Light your fire at both ends, and let the middle take care of itself.” If we then are satisfied with a citation from one of the earliest and also one of the latest authorities on the subject, we may possibly, without overburdening our space, add a little further pleasing illustration to our subject, at the same time that we shall be rendering to it all the justice of which it can be supposed to stand in need.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, the historian, and a contemporary with Constantine the Great, is one of the first of the Christian writers who has distinctly taken the line of a mild expostulation with the adherents of the Gentile superstitions; and the main drift of his important treatise, *De Præparatione Evangelica* (in fifteen books), is to prove to the educated Heathens that the Christians have the wisest and best reasons for renouncing the deception handed down from their fathers ($\tauις πατρωπαραδότου πλάνης$), and embracing the Christian doctrines. His line of proof consists in collecting from the various nations their testimony to the being and attributes of the One God. Then he goes to the Hebrew Scriptures, and collects from them the

testimony of the world before the flood as expressed by the Patriarch Henoch, the similar testimony of Noe, that of the family of Heber from which the descendants of Abraham have received the name of Hebrews, then the testimony of Job and Melchisedech, after which there follows an examination of the various schools of Greek philosophy and their tenets, from all which taken together he draws his conclusion that nothing can be more agreeable to wise and prudent reasoning than that this act of faith in God, which is the universal voice of all men, and in which all nations concur, should be followed by the further act, "et in me credite." According to Eusebius, Henoch before the flood, is the true archetypal man of the human family, because he confessed, "that not only had God by His power as Creator set everything in beautiful order in His world, but also, that like a master He ruled over the universe as if over some great city, and that He was at one and the same time both Steward and Master of the house, being both Lord and King and God."¹

Thus we perceive the early recognition that the principle we are illustrating obtained in the Catholic theology, and how, from the first, the universal belief of mankind, witnessed as well before as after their division into nations, remains for all ages the basis on which the Gospel message claims to be received.

Perfectly in accordance with the above conclusion of Eusebius is the next testimony we shall quote from a living theologian of our own century, Dr. J. H. Newman. "These opinions," writes Dr. Newman (a variety of the current popular superficial ideas have just been enumerated), "characterize a civilized age; and if I say I will not argue about Christianity with men who hold them, I do so, not as claiming any right to be peremptory or impatient with any one, but because it is plainly absurd to attempt to prove a second proposition to those who do not admit the first." (*Grammar of Assent*. By the Rev. J. H. Newman, page 411, edition 1870.)

The antichristian cause then of our day that sets itself up against this universal voice and tradition of the human family, which thus loudly proclaims the Sovereignty of God over the world which He has created, and which seeks to create human society upon its rejection and denial, rests upon two main props. These are the statesmen of the school of Prince Bismarck, and the men of science,—science, that is, so called by themselves. These statesmen, as we have said, place themselves in direct war against the universal creed of the human family, that God is the Sovereign over men. Their ostensible reason for this is that they may

¹ Τοῦ σθμαντος κυριεύειν, οἰκονομεῖν τε καὶ οἰκοδεσποτεῖν ομοῦ καὶ κύριον δύτα καὶ βασιλεα καὶ Θεόν. (Præp. Evan., vii. 307.)

be able to establish a complete unity of jurisdiction over their subjects upon the particular territory, national or imperial, whichever it may be, that they claim. They see, of course, very clearly, what indeed is scarcely less than self-evident, that if the One God whom the whole human family confesses to be Sovereign over men, is to have His worship on their territory, this worship must infallibly give rise to a brotherhood between their subjects and the subjects of the next territory. Now, inasmuch as it is in the mind of the statesmen to conquer the next territory the moment they think themselves able to make the attempt with success, in the meantime it is scarcely less than a matter of life and death with the statesmen to keep up the notion that their own subjects should faithfully regard themselves as the born enemies of the subjects of the next territory. No question but that in the eyes of Prince Bismarck, as of every other similar statesman of his school, every German is a "*thing*," whom it is all-important to keep and preserve in a proper disposition and state of mind to be ready to shoot down a Frenchman whenever he is called upon to do so. And should it be the will of God to inflict upon France the scourge of placing the French under a statesman, the counterpart of Prince Bismarck, every Frenchman, in the eyes of such a statesman, would then be nothing more than a corresponding "*thing*," existing for the sole purpose of being in readiness to shoot down a German when called upon to do so. In this way Satan, the enemy of both God and man, goes to his work of providing for the permanent and standing infliction of the scourge of war between nation and nation, people and people.

Thus statesmen are in direct antagonism with the God of heaven in respect of their impious principle of building their irreligious power on a settled system of promoting and keeping up the hostility and hatred of race against race, and of nation against nation. God would have His people become citizens of the kingdom of heaven without reference to their nationality; but these statesmen now claim them for themselves as *things*, who must be ready blindly to obey all their behests, and who must hasten to become beings, without will, without mind, without conscience, and without religion, as if their natural perfection consisted in this.

Statesmen, again, are in direct antagonism with the God of heaven on the question of education. "I am the God," says the Holy Scripture, "that teaches man knowledge" (Ps. xciii. 10). That may be very well, say these statesmen, but we are the State, which teaches man knowledge, and education *must* and *shall* be ours and subject to us alone. Again, they are in antagonism with the God of heaven on the question of unity. God, says the Holy Scripture, is He that maketh men, *unius moris in domo* (Ps. lxvii. 6), and the

God of the Christian people sets his sign before the eyes of men in the great Christian unity of the nations of the earth, under the Roman crosier of St. Peter, and the symbol of the all-conquering Cross; while the statesmen of Prince Bismarck's school set before their subjects the unity of their empire as a menace to the peace and happiness of the rest of the world, and study how they can, by their iniquitous laws, eject and eradicate from their territory the great Christian union which is the work of God, to substitute their own forced and compulsory union in its place.

But an inquirer may here stop to ask: If the God of heaven is thus supreme, as you say, how do you explain the fact of His permitting those who, as you describe them, are so directly His adversaries to prevail and to have the upper hand? "Patiens redditor Altissimus," says the book of Ecclesiasticus (Eccles. v. 4). As all flesh *must* appear before the Divine tribunal, Omnipotence is under no necessity to be precipitate. The Divine government permits the world of men to be a matter of contention between His own servants and the servants of Satan. "The Lord," says Solomon, "hath made all things for Himself, even the impious man for the evil day" (Prov. xvi. 4). Hence St. Augustine says of Nero, that he reached the extreme summit of the lust for domination, having never had an equal for licentiousness and cruelty. For the power to rule is not given to such, except by the will of the Most High God, when He judges that the affairs of men deserve to be placed under such masters. "Qui regnare facit hominem hypocritam propter perversitatem populi" (Job xxxiv. 30). (*City of God*, Book v. § 19.)

The second prop of the antichristian cause are the men of science, science, that is, so called by themselves. Whatever be the secret spring of the various errors of these men, which it must forever remain out of our power to ascertain, one thing at least is perfectly clear, that they all, each in his way, play most opportunely into the hands of the general atheism on which the statesmen of Prince Bismarck's school are seeking to build their power, and on the presumed victory of which over the universal belief of mankind in the being and sovereignty of God, they mainly rely for being able to establish the complete unity of their several empires, and by means of this to gratify, like Nero, their thirst for domination.

It is against these men of science, falsely so called, that Father Thébaud appears in the arena, to refute their theories and to vindicate, with very great learning and patience, the universality of the sacred traditions that proclaim the existence of the One Sovereign Creator and Ruler of this visible world.

The service that Father Thébaud's work renders to the cause of the Catholic religion is literally beyond calculation. Not only is

his particular argument most valuable, but he has also struck a vein of investigation, the full and perfect riches of which, as we may confidently expect, have still to be discovered.

However, it now becomes time to turn to the contents of his book, for hitherto we have been almost exclusively occupied in showing the many weighty reasons we have for recognizing in him so special a champion of the Catholic cause.

Father Thébaud points out in his preface that the efforts of those whose aim has been to place science in antagonism to revelation have been reduced to naught, as regards the attempt to prove from the historic records of India, Egypt, Greece, and other ancient nations, that man must claim an antiquity of hundreds of thousands of years. The precise dates which modern critics have been able to assign to the real origin of all nations entirely defeats their end, in consequence of which they have been obliged to take an entirely new direction. Hence the celebrated theory of "evolution." The desirable fruit of this theory is, of course, the immense time, wholly inconsistent with revelation, during which man must have existed in a state of unconsciousness and of progressive advance to consciousness before he arrived at the state in which he is found now.

On this Father Thébaud observes in his preface as follows :

"This, of course, supposes that the whole system of 'evolution' has been proved without fear of contradiction. This will scarcely be maintained even by the most fervent 'scientists.' And what is more we will venture to assert that such a demonstration never will be forthcoming. But we will not insist on this. Our purport is very different. We say, we assert that if things had taken place as the evolutionists assure us they have, the first records of mankind would be those of rude people just emerging from barbarism. In point of art and culture, in point of ideas and language, chiefly in point of religion, we should find in their social state the most rude elements of a '*childish*' and '*growing*' soul. We should be able to trace the steps by which, from the first notions of a coarse religious system, they would have arrived at the point of '*inventing God and all His attributes*'! This would have been in the sense of the evolutionists a mere subjective theory perfectly independent of any objective divine essence, and having nothing in common with the certain belief that the reason of man can know God and demonstrate to himself His existence. They assert it has been so, and that historical man began everywhere by being a barbarian. Here we join issue with them, and one of the great purports of this volume will be to establish solidly the fact, that man appeared first in the state of civilization, possessed of noble ideas as to his own origin from the Creator, the one supreme God ruling the universe, etc. We intend to prove historically that man invented none of the great religious and moral truths by the process mentioned above, but that these came to him from heaven. We will endeavor to show the first men everywhere monotheists, generally pure in their morals, dignified in their bearing, cultivated in their intellect. Should this be well and firmly established, the whole of the monstrous system of evolution falls to the ground. Still more will this be the case if it be proved that the supposed 'continuous progress,' which is the mainstay of their theory, is a dream, a nonentity; that, on the contrary, man everywhere progressed in the wrong direction, going from monotheism to pantheism, from this to idolatry, and from this last to 'individualism' in religion; and that this seems to be the law which has governed mankind until a divine Redeemer came to bring back man to truth, and to found at last a true and strict religious society, not confined to one nation like Judaism, but universal." (Preface, p. 10.)

Father Thébaud is fully aware of the vital importance of his subject, and would not have this in any way overlooked:

"Gentilism," to quote his words, "in fact has remained until our days in a state of hopeless confusion, and the author of *Gentile and Jew* has not in the least rendered the subject clearer. We have not the presumption to lay claim to more erudition than is contained in the above-mentioned work, nor even to as much. But we complain that the reader rises from its perusal not one whit more enlightened on the subject of the origin and growth of the whole delusion than when he commenced it. Now we think that something can be said on a subject at once so instructive and so interesting. And it is time to say it. For this we will call to our help what we know of antiquity, and by its aid alone endeavor to explain the enigma of the origin of error. On our way we may investigate some celebrated myths on which we think a flood of light has been thrown by late investigations. The greater number of them, however, are quite without any such illumination, and thus we leave them in their obscurity."

"The valuable discoveries lately made in the antiquities of India, Bactriana, Egypt, and Greece render possible such a short work as we undertake. It would have been little more than theoretical some fifty years ago. By these discoveries the range of Gentilism has been greatly extended. Formerly scarcely anything was understood by the word but what came to us from Greece and Rome. Now the whole Gentile world, and chiefly the central part of it, Hindostan and Egypt, has to be included, and as in this study each part helps the whole, the actual knowledge we have of India and Central Asia throws a flood of light on the mythology of Egypt and Greece. Many things indeed which could not be known to the Greeks of the age of Pericles, which were perfectly unknown to the Romans, which were scarcely and dimly seen fifty years ago, are now clear and palpable, and the sure derivation of truth and error from the east and north towards the west and south must now be considered a fact above possible contradiction." (Preface, p. 12.)

Then, after some remarks of a similar purport, he adds:

"A last remark of consequence, in conclusion, is that the subject, most important and interesting as it is in itself, possesses besides this advantage, that it is the natural prelude to considerations of a far higher import. In studying the religious aspect of the world during several thousand years of Gentilism, we are naturally attracted by the grand spectacle offered to our view, when at the end, the decomposition of all previous religious principles took place to make room for another pouring out of divine effulgence, this time to last forever. . . .

"Gentilism becomes thus the natural introduction to the new, complete, final revelation which followed it. Religion, invested henceforth with the permanent characters of universality, perpetuity, holiness, takes from henceforward the guidance of the world, never to lose its hold, in spite of all obstacles and of millions of enemies. . . . Be ours then the modest task of describing the times which preceded Christianity. There was no church then; at least no universal church claiming the love and homage of all mankind. It was only the conflict of unorganized truth with all the passions of man and all the fury of hell. The result was unavoidable. Truth could not stand. Error and vice were destined to conquer. Not so now, thank God! The world has now the Church to contend against, and the Church is stronger than the world." (Preface, p. 15.)

The one great truth then that Father Thébaud contends for is that the human creation came from the hands of God, and that the Divine care over the world of man has left ample evidence of itself, which may still be gathered up and collected.

The following passage gives us an insight into the author's esti-

mate of the care which God took of His creation, that man should not be without His knowledge:

“The reader, we trust, is now prepared to understand the real Catholicity established at first amongst mankind, and which took a directly religious aspect by the dogmatic truths and the exterior rites of worship, which most certainly a primitive revelation alone could grant liberally and equally to all the children of Adam. We call this Patriarchal Catholicity; and the uniformity of religious traditions among men in primitive ages, a well-established fact, proves it beyond question. . . .

“The nations on parting from each other carried evidently to their new homes the treasure confided to man at the first unveiling of God Himself to our humanity, and we shall be able to trace many points of the direction this ‘treasure’ took. The dogmas of the unity of the Godhead, preserved at least in the personality of One Supreme among the gods; of the exalted state of primeval man during the golden age; of his fall, the cause of all his misfortunes; of the immortality of the soul even after the fall; of the hope left at the bottom of Pandora’s box; of the necessity of expiations for sin; of sacrifices consequently, chiefly the sacrifice of pure and innocent victims; of a possible expiation of sinful man by the austerity of penance, except perhaps in the case of some few great inexpiable crimes; of the communication of guilt passing from father to son, kept till our days in the legislation of China, but in antiquity universal among all nations,—these truths stand out clear and precise in the infancy of all races, and previously to the idolatry by which they were gradually clouded, though kept for a long time under the veil of types or myths.” (Page 31.)

This primeval religion, according to Father Thébaud,

“derived its truths from a primitive revelation, which may be said to have formed in their complexity a system of belief and a code of morality all-sufficient for the guidance of mankind, and the germs of this primitive revelation have been found scattered, yet preserved, in the traditions of all nations. Should this not be admitted, the universality of these traditions is inexplicable.” (Page 33.)

Father Thébaud calls this original divine revelation “*the treasure*,” and promises to trace the direction which it took among the nations. But there came a cause which brought about a gradual weakening of this “treasure.” This cause was the division of the people of the earth into nations speaking different languages.

“It is clear,” he says, “that a merely human religion cannot overcome such an obstacle as this (viz., nationality) to unity; hence all false religions are national, and, with such a constant and powerful cause of divergence (as this nationality), what was first common among men becomes gradually weakened and finally must disappear.”

Then he adds that it is the purpose of his book to establish in detail how the effect of this nationality has been to cause the common traditions to grow more and more dim, vague, and uncertain, until they became veiled and obliterated by successive additions and perversions of error (page 49).

We may judge of the sovereign importance of Father Thébaud’s investigations to the present work of the Catholic Church from the very word, “*TREASURE*,” by which he describes the original gift of God to His creation. The Catholic Church is at open issue with the whole world of modern unbelief on this very point. The world of unbelief not only refuses all assent to the doctrine that God was

the author and giver of the treasure, but treats the very treasure itself with open and undisguised contempt as not being in any sense of the word a treasure at all. Father Thébaud defines the main outlines and marks of the "treasure," and traces its progress in Hindostan, then in Central Asia and Africa, next in Pelasgic Greece; after this in the early writings of Greece, Homer, Hesiod, and other early poets, then in the Hellenic philosophy, and lastly in the Greek and Latin literature. Modern unbelief simply looks on, smiles, and treats it all as a mere degree in the progressive mental consciousness, a stage in the process of the general evolution. "Terram desiderabilem pro nihilo habuerunt" (Ps. cv. 24).

But to bring our rapid review of this work of Father Thébaud's to a conclusion. There are two principal lasting impressions which it must leave so firmly stamped upon the mind, that no power can obliterate them.

(I.) The first is the inexpressible value to the actual missionary work of the Catholic Church at the present hour of the general truth, of which Father Thébaud's investigations are directed to furnish the historical evidence, viz., that God gave, in the beginning, to His human creation a full and complete revelation for their guidance.

(II.) That the vein of investigation which Father Thébaud has struck, and in which he has proved himself so distinguished a laborer, is one in which there lie concealed many equally great riches to reward the research that may be pursued in the same persevering and Christian spirit.

There is not a Catholic priest engaged in the work of his ministry in any town, large or small, who does not stand in daily need of having his mind stored with the knowledge to be found in the pages of Father Thébaud's work. Where is there the town, large or small, where there are not numbers of men who run away with the notion that modern science has completely and irrevocably done away with the ancient biblical traditions about the world and its early history; and how is any Catholic, particularly a priest, in a condition to confront such men, except he has studied in Father Thébaud's school, and has learned to understand that the Catholic Church has to contend for the truth of these sacred traditions as "pro aris et focis." To her these traditions are the apple of the eye. "Nova et vetera" is the divinely given motto of the Catholic religion, the *nova* Christ has brought to us, the *vetera* have come down to us through this sacred tradition. The *vetera* are prior in order of time, the *nova* in order of dignity. Our faith as Catholics is not different from that of the city of God, which confessed and worshipped God before the flood, but is an expansion of that which preceded. Noe in the Ark, Job, and many of the nobler spirits in the Gentile world who have spoken of God and

have confessed Him, are, in their degree, spokesmen of our faith equally with Moses, and the kings and prophets of Israel. It concerns us, therefore, to defend and claim for our own all the true traditions of God among the nations; and whoever the man of science, falsely so called, may be who attempts to deny or discredit these in whatever way, he is, even though he fails to be aware of it himself, a partner in the war against the Christian cause; and even if he is an unconscious confederate, still he is a confederate, and, what is even still worse, a blind instrument in the hands of the conspiracy of the infidel statesmen against the just rights and liberties of the Christian people who are subjected to their rule.

The knowledge supplied in the pages of Father Thébaud's book is the more indispensable to every educated Catholic, and, of course, more than ever to the priest, for the reason that the ordinary unbeliever of our times is seldom very much more than a man who readily contents himself with the belief that there are other men in existence, possessed of great scientific repute, who victoriously maintain the particular scientific propositions which justify his unbelief. Let any one of this class come in contact with a fairly intelligent Catholic who has made a careful study of Father Thébaud's work, and, if he does not depart from the conversation converted, he must at least depart from it with his pride humbled, his assurance abashed, and his ignorance exposed. This in any one solitary case is no mean victory for the cause of religion, and when we remember what St. Paul says "of the speakers of vain things, who subvert whole houses and whose mouths must be stopped" (Tit. i. 11), the practical importance of the service which Father Thébaud has rendered, in placing within general reach his compact and incisive method of proceeding to stop the mouth of the modern infidel speaker of vain things, with whose presence extremely few places of public resort can escape being infested, will not be very easily overestimated.

The second lasting impression to be derived from Father Thébaud's work, namely, the extraordinary richness of the new vein of investigation—his diligence and success in the working of which we have been unable to commend in a manner equal to its deserts—leads to the few brief remarks with which we must conclude, taking the opportunity to announce that, at no distant date, in a future number of the REVIEW, we hope to present its readers with a tangible proof that this alleged richness of the subject of "Gentilism" is something very much more than a mere flower of reviewer's rhetoric, rather a very genuine and solid reality intimately affecting the future work of the Church on one of the sovereignly important branches of its daily labor, viz., the early formation and direction of the mind and intelligence of its educated classes.

We cannot escape from the necessity of being painfully aware of the generally lamentable inadequacy of the attempts on the Christian side, to point out to an honest inquirer the hand of God visibly guiding the destinies of the nations during the long checkered reign of this "Gentilism," the latter years of which were marked by so deplorable an alienation of the nations from the truths of the original revelation. Father Thébaud speaks of his own work as being of "*so vast and exalted a nature as to inspire with fear the heart of any one who should make the bold attempt.*" Hence he wisely and prudently prescribes to himself limits within which to occupy him with the work of investigating the progress of the great "Divine Treasure" over the earth.

It is not part of his subject to investigate and reply to objections that may be raised against the actual course itself of the Divine government; and yet it must be manifest that the more evident the truth of the acts of the Divine government become, through the historical confirmation which they receive from such works as that of Father Thébaud, the more questions must necessarily arise as to the why and the wherefore these acts became part of the Divine government.

God Almighty is never to be supposed to be angry with the created intelligence for desiring to know the why and the wherefore of the Divine acts, so long as the desire to know is under the proper sense of the duty which the creature owes to the Creator. The sin and offence of the infidel consists in his impious and daring denial that there is anything to know or any room for knowledge. Father Thébaud's subject supplies us with a case in point. The whole nature of his investigation is affected by the confusion of languages which took place at the Tower of Babel.

The truth of this event he fully confirms, and inflicts a most just reprobation on the ignorance as well as on the insolent impiety which has spoken of it as the "first of the Arabian tales," but it is obvious that a perfectly legitimate question may here be asked. If God Almighty foresaw all the evils which Father Thébaud rightly traces to the division of mankind into languages, and to the consequent isolation of the various tribal and national families of men from one another, whereby false religions multiplied (all national religions, except the peculiar national religion of the Jews, incline to become false), what adequate and becoming motive can be assigned, why, with all these inevitable evils in view, God Almighty still decreed the division into languages?

Father Thébaud is not to be subject to the least accusation for omitting to start and reply to an important question of this kind. We here also merely make a passing mention of it, as exemplifying the truth for which we are contending, namely, that the vein which

Father Thébaud's work has struck us inexpressibly rich, and we may hope that it will please God to spare him, to continue long to labor in it and make new discoveries of its riches.

As for the promise we ourselves have made, it will not be necessary to say more here than that the paper we have announced will fully enter into the above-mentioned subject, and will undertake to lay open a further branch of the subject of Gentilism, namely, the reasons why God decreed to inflict upon men the division into various languages, and in what way He has since been pleased to make an especial choice of the city of Rome to remedy the evils flowing from the division of Babel, by restoring to men the unity which they lost through the city of Babel, and by giving to Rome the mission to be the guardian and preserver among the nations of the truths of the original revelation, to the stability of which the separation into languages proved so extremely disastrous.

A PLAN FOR THE PROPOSED CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

Discourses upon the Scope and Nature of University Education. By John Henry Newman, D.D. Dublin, 1852.

The Office and Work of Universities. By John Henry Newman, D.D. London, 1856.

IN the previous article incidental mention has been made of what the University should be, and of the work that it is intended to accomplish. It has been also declared that the college system of our country is not only defective, were its present nominal requirements carried out, but that those requirements are most frequently in practice ignored. As a result of this latter abuse we have admitted that, for a time and in the beginning, the University will be obliged to modify, to tone down, largely her legitimate requirements touching the admission of candidates for matriculation, and this, for the very evident reason that unless she did so it would be simply impossible to find students. But we have expressed ourselves very ill indeed, if the impression has been left on any mind that the entire culpability in the matter rests with the colleges. They certainly deserve and must accept a large share of the blame; but the evil lay at all times much deeper, viz., in the preparatory schools and academies, which are but of late beginning to take proper shape and to bear fruit among Catholics, and, among non-

Catholics, are allowed to grow up and die out, to do the work undertaken or omit it at their own sweet will, which may be said to be almost entirely in the hands of private and irresponsible boarding-house keepers, under the name of principals. These swarm throughout the country; and while some of them, doubtless, are fair enough schools, they are so, despite the system of their establishment and maintenance, a system than which nothing can be more pernicious. Most of them, however, are wretchedly bad; nor would it be possible to denounce them too strongly. No guarantee of educational fitness being required on the part of those who start them, and diligent and persistent advertising serving to make a speedy reputation, men of no educational parts take up the boarding-school business just as they would any mercantile speculation, and for the very self-same ends for which they might open a *house-renting agency* or an *intelligence office*. These men are mostly those who have failed in other trades and pursuits, and naturally education in such schools is made entirely subordinate to other, and to the manager, more valuable, considerations. We all know what "*home comforts*," what "*salubrious localities*," and what "*moderate charges*" they all set forth in their prospectuses. The principal is, it may be, neither teacher nor scholar. Assistants and tutors are chosen without any other recommendation for capacity or examination of acquirements than a knowledge of the low rates at which they are willing to give their services. Very many of them are woefully incompetent teachers, possessing but the most rudimentary knowledge of the subjects they pretend to teach. It is a system which would not be tolerated for a week in any country of Continental Europe, and yet it is our only one. It has done, and is doing, an incalculable harm—an injury not to be gauged merely by loss of money to the parents and of time to the unfortunate boys submitted to it, but is, in the case of the latter, irremediable throughout life. A late writer in the *Westminster Review* remarks very forcibly on this subject, that "*the evils caused by bad baking or bad cobbling can be easily remedied; the evils of a bad education are often irremediable and destructive to body and soul.*" We say nothing as to "free trade" in other respects, but, as applied to education, it is a most wretched and mischievous absurdity. But while this statement of the condition of things in the schools preparatory to our colleges shows that the evils of which we complain did not originate with the latter institutions, it by no means excuses the colleges which, feeble as they were, were yet the highest educational authority in the land. They might, by outspoken denunciation and active repressive measures, have abolished, or largely checked the abuse; but they failed to make any utterance on the subject, and supinely accepted all comers, knowing full well that

want of preparation had absolutely incapacitated large numbers of their students from ever accomplishing even the most merely nominal educational course, yet shoved them on from class to class, and, if they stayed the allotted time and paid the regulation bills, capped the climax and stultified themselves by giving the poor wretches diplomas, and dubbing them B. A.'s before a gaping crowd some fine commencement day. By such inertness and supineness, on the part of our colleges, this abuse has been permitted to grow into a gigantic evil, which they are utterly unable to cope with, and which lays very serious obstacles in the way of establishing the only effectual agency for its repression, viz., the University, the claims of which we now urge. It is useless to insist, that some of the colleges carry on preparatory departments within themselves. They do, in some instances, make the attempt; but all who know anything on the subject, know how that operates. A college must be what it is, and nothing else; and it is invariably either all *preparatory school*, all *collegiate department*, or else, and most frequently, "*de utroque melius siletur*."

We regret being compelled to digress so far from the direct line of argument and explication, which was laid down in a former article,¹ and which we now resume. But the subject is a very wide one; new vistas open up with every step in advance, and where a numerous class become possessed of a vested interest in the maintenance of a false, vicious or corrupt system, we are sorry to acknowledge that pure reason is of little avail in removing prejudice. The personal interests of a class, banded together by the tie of special advantages accruing from the maintenance of a certain system, will, it seems, always instigate to the retention of the system, how undeniably wrong soever said system may be. It was this, viz., the numbers pecuniarily interested in its maintenance, that gave persistent vitality to slavery; it is this that prevents the sweeping into the ocean of oblivion of state-Church establishments and standing armies, of the fanfaronade of diplomacy, and the absurdities of aristocracy and class privileges. So, too, what with professors and teachers, trustees and alumni of the seven hundred colleges of our land—towns, the value of whose real estate might be diminished by pricking the bubble of their "*institutions'*" repute, in a literary point of view, to say nothing of the so-called academies, etc., which must, in case of the establishment of a University, either soon collapse, or take an entirely different educational tack—we perceive that we shall have a host of opponents. But the moving cause with all these people is so obvious, and the arguments hitherto advanced so pithless, that we shall not at present pursue them.

¹ *Shall we have a University?* American Catholic Quarterly Review, 1876.

We now reach a point in the investigation where there is a strong possibility, nay, a very reasonable probability of wide divergencies of opinion, on the part of those who favor the establishment of the University. Every one of the next three points,—*i. e.*, the general plan of the establishment, the number, duties, mode of election and retirement of professors, and the initial examination, duties, discipline, and classification of students,—is liable to be regarded by different minds from diverse standpoints; and as a result, the views taken and conclusions arrived at will be materially discrepant. We can only give our own notions on the subject for what they are worth, hoping that in the collision of ideas the best and soundest plans may be reached.

Now, the proposed University will be an institution intended to last for ages (destined, we fully trust, to fulfil the intent of its founders); and it follows thence that many regulations and enactments (which cannot now be foreseen or fully provided for, owing to our ignorance of the special circumstances that may arise, even a generation hence) will become necessary, and provision will in the beginning have to be made for such changes or modifications, not inconsistent with the spirit of the institution and the purposes of its founders and benefactors; yet there are certain regulations that must necessarily be made at the outset, *permanent*, and though *modifiable*, yet not *reversible*. Such are the charter under which its operations shall be conducted; who shall be its first corporators, *i. e.*, how, by whom, and with what view, they are to be selected; how their succession shall be perpetuated; what shall be their duties and responsibility for the performance thereof; what provision shall be made for amending the charter; and above all, how the original endowment and subsequently accruing benefactions may be invested; how the property of the establishment may be so secured, that in case of insurrection or civil war it may have the greatest likelihood of immunity from jeopardy of seizure, confiscation, or any other diversion from the ends for which it was intended to be employed. The mode of effecting the last-mentioned desideratum will be mainly a matter for the consideration of those who shall frame the first charter—an instrument which should embody all the above points, cover as much ground as practicable, and leave as little legislation as may be possible to be done by the corporators subsequently; in other words, care should be exercised in the framing of the charter, that all future corporators should understand themselves to be conservators and overseers of an institution operating in accordance with fixed principles and stated regulations, not absolute owners of an establishment running at their whim and with a legislation varying according to the changing disposition of their members. In this paper we design simply

to make *obiter* suggestions of what would seem to us needed on some of the points mentioned. To sketch out a full charter and code of laws for such an institution as we propose would require, not a couple of articles in a review, but a considerable volume. We hope, however, that the initiation of the subject may elicit other and larger views in the interest of the proposed institution. For, whether this establishment proceed now, or ten, or twenty years hence, it must and will finally be carried into effect; and every suggestion, every line written on the subject, will tend to develop either assent or contradiction, and in either case to stimulate thought on the subject. This is the more necessary, as both the idea and the mode of carrying it into effect are new to our people of the United States; nor is it rationally to be expected that a people, so sensitive to adverse criticism as we have always shown ourselves, should at the first presentation cheerfully chime in with an idea or plan such as this. European in origin and practice, the necessity for adopting it is based upon the admission that our mode of education in the higher branches in the United States has been hitherto very false, fatally defective; and that, in the matter of mental culture of the superior grade, we may yet learn a great deal from the universities of the Old World. A great deal will have been accomplished, the time and labor of writing will have been well expended, if we can convince the community, or any considerable portion of it, through the faults of the present or the advantages of the proposed system, that the time has come for establishing a *Catholic National University* in the United States. Should we even fail of entire success in convincing them, it will still be a move in the right direction to have set the Catholic mind to work on the subject.

The corporators should be at least eighteen, and should, in the first instance, be selected by the archbishops of the country. It might be desirable to divide the members, so that a certain proportion should be clergymen, another similar proportion made up equally of members of the medical and legal professions, and the remainder of Catholic laymen, whether scientific, literary or engaged in business pursuits. But all should be men of education and of as high culture as the country affords, irreproachable of life, entirely competent to comprehend thoroughly the vastness of the work, the oversight of which is intrusted to them, and sensible of the importance of all their acts as corporators of the institution. While it would be far better that they should be both able and willing themselves to perform the duty of "*examining board*" of candidates for professorships of all grades, of students applying for admission at the beginning of each year, and that they should be present at all the stated examinations during the session of the

University; yet if they should deem it more desirable, or feasible, they might delegate that duty to a board of competent men, either temporarily or permanently, as should seem best. In all cases they should appoint the professors of all grades. The professors should appoint yearly one from among their own number as rector, and should have also the appointment of all the subordinate officers of the house. Any officer, once appointed, is only to be dismissed by the corporators.

How the corporators should be perpetuated is, we confess, a matter of considerable difficulty to our mind. One thing alone is clear, that they should not be a self-perpetuating body nor have any voice in the selection of a new corporator in place of one who may have resigned, been dismissed, or become incapacitated. All experience shows us that public bodies possessing this power of continuing their own existence, either degenerate in the long run into a ring, or become a mere incubus upon the establishments over which they preside. With all such bodies that we have ever been acquainted with, the final result was either *Young Americanism* (by which we mean too great a readiness to remove the old landmarks), *old fogeyism* (or a stupid and senseless clinging to every ancient prejudice and custom), or *utter mediocrity and inertness* (*i.e.*, the condition of being "*neither fish nor flesh*," and of doing absolutely nothing but what is forced upon them). We see at present no better plan than that the archbishops should fill all vacancies occurring among the corporators, making the selection, of course, in accordance with the class or section to which the outgoing member belonged. The corporators should, in all cases, be paid by a fixed rate for travelling expenses, and all time *necessarily* spent in attendance on behalf of the University. They should make all laws necessary for the management and control of the University, should publish them immediately on their enactment, and it should be competent for them, at any time, to call in the body of professors or any single class of them as an advisory body. The professors so called in should have the right to vote on the question in regard to which they were called.

The first duty of the corporators after appointment would be, of course, the formation of a proper charter and procuring its passage. The next and most important, the securing of the initial endowment. For whether the University should establish itself where there has heretofore been no institution of learning, or ally with itself some one or other of the existing colleges, in either case property must be purchased and paid for. There would be no certainty, rather a very great unlikelihood, that the receipts from fees would, for several years to come, pay the professors; and we are of those who have never yet been convinced that a debt, whether public, corporational,

or private, is a blessing ; but we believe it to be, on the contrary, an incubus, and more or less of a blight on every enterprise that struggles along under it. We do not see how the institution could be fairly floated into deep water and set in running order with less than \$500,000, of which \$100,000 should go for land and the necessary buildings, and \$50,000 for furniture, apparatus (chemical and physical), library, etc., the remaining \$350,000 being securely invested, as a permanent fund, for professors' salaries, repairs and enlargement of buildings, increase of library and chemical, astronomical, and philosophical apparatus. We take for granted that, from the beginning, the fees paid by students would cover the housekeeping expenses of the whole community, all of whom, except the married professors, should live in the institution and board in common. Now the interest on the sum invested would be \$21,000 annually, which with whatever surplus there might remain from fees, after paying all household expenses, would be the amount left for paying corporators' expenses, professors' and officers' salaries, and the other extra expenditures. It is very plain that for some few years the salaries would have to be comparatively small ; nor, to say truth, should we consider this a great hardship, since, with our notion of what a Catholic university should be, the prominent idea in the mind of the professor or other officer likely to do credit to the institution, should be, not the amount of salary to be pocketed but the opportunity of doing most good ; not how much shall I get per annum, but how many shall I be able to influence, and how great an effect shall I be able to exert upon them, morally and mentally, for their good temporally and the eternal advantage of us both ? Nor will the professor, unable to take that view of the case, ever be likely to assist materially in the building of the great moral and religious edifice that this institution is yet destined to prove ; on which account we shall bear with tolerable equanimity the lack of any collaborators whose zeal in the good work would be just in proportion to the pecuniary results realized. Whatever might be the attendance and however large the endowments might in future become, the salaries of the professors should never exceed a fixed sum (to be established by the corporators) ; all fees beyond that amount, and all income, from whatever source (save such as may have been specifically donated or devised for a given purpose) going to the general objects of the institution in a given ratio, or certain fixed percentage of the whole, toward each necessary object.

The report of the commission appointed by the British government a few years since to inquire into the revenues of Oxford and Cambridge, developed the astounding fact that the gross revenues of both establishments in 1871 amounted to £754,405, and, as a

very large portion of this is derived from landed property (the estimated quantity of acres belonging to the two institutions being over 320,000), this income is capable of indefinite increase, and has, in fact, enormously increased of late years. Yet in a nation of more than 20,000,000 inhabitants, the students in residence at these two ancient universities rarely amount, nowadays, to more than four thousand, a proportion of the population absurdly small in comparison with the amount of means expended. Now that there must be something wrong here, is evident. We have already admitted the influence and power of those institutions in establishing and maintaining the political supremacy of England, and the fact that they still mould and direct, even though they no longer lead public opinion. It would take up too much space, and divert us too far from our present subject, to show the various causes that have contributed to shear these institutions of so much of their former all-controlling intellectual influence; while yet, *by little more than the university form of instruction*, they still wield so much power in educating men to uprightness and honor, to self-respect, and in exercising a humanizing effect upon the morals of the age. To give our conclusions will suffice without the proofs on which they are based, and in our opinion these reasons are the palsying influence of the connection between Church and State, the absurd system of fellowships, the enormous salaries and emoluments paid professors and other officials, the numerous sinecures, the disgraceful partiality in the appointment of professors, and what Dr. Newman calls "the heathen code of ethics inculcated." If, then, laboring under all these blighting influences, these institutions have been confessedly so effective socially, so potent politically, and so energetic morally and mentally, why should not we, establishing our University under the benign influence of true religion, untrammelled by any governmental alliance, and inculcating the morals of the Church, avoid the other abuses and wrongs into which they have fallen, and thus soon be able to point proudly to a body of young men fully as well trained mentally, incomparably their superiors morally, and able to put forth a far more abiding influence, in both regards, upon an age that badly needs true control—a generation too sympathetic with fraud and dishonesty?

It will, therefore, be the bounden duty of the corporators to take order in the beginning that no endowment may become overgrown, to provide against sinecures, to see that nothing of a nature at all similar to the present system of English fellowships shall ever creep in, and to put such stringent safeguards about the professorial appointments that fraud, partiality, family influence, and favoritism (if it were possible) may never be able even to be suspected, much less actually to exist in connection therewith. Let the age of sine-

cure and incompetency cease; let sinecureists step down, and paid workers step in. We do not want our students chiefly talked about in connection with a boat race, or our professors to be only known to the public by a jangle over their appointment to a notoriously lucrative office. In fine, it would be equally difficult to specify all the prescriptive and precautionary enactments to be made by the corporators as it is impossible to exaggerate the importance to success of their taking a broad view of the situation, and framing both their charter and code of enactments in accordance therewith. To do this, they must not only themselves be men of the highest literary culture, but familiar with the systems of university education prevailing in the different countries of Europe, free from prejudice, able to discern the merely showy and specious from the genuine and valuable, and determined to be guided in the adoption of studies and regulations not by what is popular and taking, but by the dictates of sound judgment as to the influence of the studies, and experience as to the nature and results of the enactments. A body of men so selected, carefully examining the ground and giving us the results of their deliberate thought on the different systems of the higher education, will be able to accomplish a great deal toward removing that "*dead weight of public indifference*" which has enabled the wretched College system and the still more deplorable irresponsible horde of Bedouin preparatory schools, so long to block up the way to an educational reform, the necessity for which cannot be too frequently reiterated, nor too pointedly presented to the minds of our countrymen.

Next in order comes the question as to the number of professorships, their grades, the studies to be taught, the mode of imparting instruction, etc., etc. The subject is multifarious; to touch its parts singly is out of question in our limited space; but a few suggestions can do no harm, and we know no better mode of getting at the right on this matter than by expressing such views as we may entertain, since we shall be likely thereby to bring upon the arena men competent to discuss the subject and who feel an interest in it. The salient points are the only ones that we shall touch. Now, a University should have from its inception four Faculties, viz., of *Theology*, of *Law*, of *Medicine*, and of *Literature or Academic Studies*.

The Theological Faculty should consist of five professors, viz., of Dogmatic Theology, of Moral Theology, of Ecclesiastical History and Liturgy, of Hebrew and Oriental Literature, and of Canon Law.

The Legal Faculty should be made up of three professors, viz., of Common and Statute Law, of Civil and International Law, and of Admiralty Law and Pleadings.

The Medical Faculty should comprise four professors, viz., of Surgery and Medical Jurisprudence, of Materia Medica and Therapeutics, of Obstetrics, and of Anatomy and Physiology.

The Academic Faculty proper should be composed of fifteen professors, viz.:.

1. Latin.	9. Logic, and History, Ancient and Modern.
2. Greek.	10. Natural Philosophy.
3. Hebrew and Sanskrit.	11. Chemistry.
4. Anglo-Saxon and English Literature.	12. French.
5. Philology and Ethnography.	13. German.
6. Algebra, Surveying, Mensuration, and Geometry, etc.	14. Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Political Economy.
7. Applied Mathematics and Astronomy.	15. Geology, Mineralogy, and Botany.
8. Integral and Differential Calculus, and Intermediate Mathematics.	

In addition to which provision should be made for instruction in Spanish, Italian, the Scandinavian and Slavonic tongues, as soon as practicable.

It will thus be seen that we propose the establishment of the University with fifteen academic professors and five theological. This is on the hypothesis that it may be found desirable to leave the Faculties of Law and Medicine in abeyance or unprovided for until the other portions of the system shall have begun to produce their expected fruits. For we think it altogether likely, considering the fatal facility with which students enter those two professions at present, that, with rare exceptions, our University alone would furnish students sufficiently imbued with a love of learning for its own sake, and sufficiently convinced of the necessity of thorough literary and scientific knowledge in those professions, to withstand the temptation presented to them by the present facile and venal legal and medical schools of our country. Indeed, that temptation is to the ignorant, or, what is still worse, to the partially educated, the mentally half-formed, well-nigh irresistible. We think it then highly desirable to make the beginning of the University with the fifteen professorships above mentioned, leaving law and medicine to be provided for at a more convenient season; but it must be borne well in mind that that season should be as soon as there is a reasonable certainty of obtaining a fair class of well-prepared students in either or both.

It will be said that the subjects above mentioned in the academic course are, with very few exceptions, those which are taught in our colleges, and that, in some of the latter institutions, are taught subjects not mentioned in the above lists. There is an immense difference between *teaching* and *teaching*. The same terms stand in different places for very different objects. How many different kinds of birds are known by the name of *Quail*? what divers and

non-correlated species of fish by the name of *Bass* in various sections of the English-speaking world? English composition is proclaimed in the prospectus as taught in every academy throughout the length and breadth of the land, and it looks well as a word, graces and sets off a catalogue to advantage. But it looks a great deal better on the master's catalogue than it does on the boy's paper. There is not a college of the 700 in this country that does not profess to teach Latin, and not merely that, but nine of every ten catalogues flaunt it at you under the form and style of "*Latin Language and Literature and Roman Antiquities.*" If there be anything which they learn thoroughly, it should be this language, for the students are supposed to have, at least, begun it in the preparatory school, and to have passed, if you believe the catalogue, some sort of examination in it before entering college, where they should have been regularly reciting in it for four years. Ask the young *soi-disant* B.A.'s themselves, not whether they could hold a half hour's conversation with Tullius or Pomponius, for perhaps this might by some be considered too much to expect; but ask them (and we suppose that they are the best students from the best colleges that we have), ask them whether they can read and enjoy Tacitus, Persius, Cicero, or Tibullus, as they read and enjoy Macaulay, Dryden, Brougham, or Thomson. They have *not* learned the language, and they will not say so. They have dabbled in it, but as to learning it in the same sense in which one learns English or any language that he wishes to *know*, there is not one in ten thousand of them that has done it, and the ten thousandth man most likely did the work without material assistance from his "*alma mater infidelis.*" Yet, unless a person does learn a language at the very least so as to read it with perfect facility, what becomes of the utility of the study as a means of elevating the *taste*? Still the partisans of the college system insist on the *culture of taste* that is gained by the students in attaining that wretchedly insufficient acquaintance with classics, which we see them have, and which will not be denied. We answer that the taste is not cultivated by *studying* the classics but by *mastering* them, by acquiring such a familiarity with these works as will enable us to appreciate their excellencies, and this familiarity, or anything in the remotest degree resembling it, our graduates have not attained. All that has been hinted about Latin holds still more largely true of Greek. The same graduate who can pick his staggering way through select bits of *easy* authors in Latin, can no more take the idea of Aristophanes, than he can read and understand the *Mécanique Céleste*, and Newton's *Principia* done into English would be easy and entertaining reading to him compared with Longinus. Faugh! Let us away with this sham, quietly nourished and fostered as it has been

so long by our colleges, which send forth annual shoals of such young men with diplomas in their hands. The fraud cries aloud for a remedy. The atmosphere is tainted with the noisomeness of blatant ignorance! *It is much better with other branches of study*, we are told. Of course it is; and *that*, you father, you guardian, engaged at home in business, and paying semi-annual bills for the last four years, will find out very readily by starting your graduated son or ward to open a new set of books in lieu of your chief bookkeeper. Or you may have bought a small farm which you would like to have surveyed. Furnish the Bachelor with theodolite, chain, and metes, and let him survey it for you. Tell him the rate of exchange on London, the coin value of the pieces you give him, and dispatch him to procure the value in a draft on England. Set him to measure and take account of the number of perches of rough stone that those teams at your door shall deliver you in the day; or the number of feet of pine boards, plank and scantling, that have been furnished already for your new house. Elicit his views on the number of tiles necessary for house, back building, and kitchen roof, giving him dimensions and pitch, slate and pencil. You will find that (unless he learned it somewhere else than at school or college) he cannot open a stock account, your land will remain unsurveyed, the broker, so disposed, will cheat him to his face, the drivers will laugh at your measurer, and he will throw up the tile question in disgust. Has he then learned anything, and if so, what? The thing that he is most likely to have acquired to the greatest perfection is exactly that for which he has least reason to thank his professors, *i. e.*, facility and confidence in public extemporaneous speaking, and it may be, a readiness in committing his ideas to paper, both faculties but little fostered by the college authorities, and principally obtained or largely improved in the debating societies.

The intention of our university is entirely different, and its results will either be more valuable, practically as well as theoretically, or else the idea were better never broached. But what should prevent us from accomplishing in this country, in education, what is constantly done, and well done in the Prussian and other universities of the Continent? It is very easy, and just as false as it is easy, to cry "*Utopian*," and thereby attempt to stigmatize by an epithet,—but it is only those who have too imperfect a knowledge of the question and the facts connected with it to secure our confidence in their judgment on the subject, who will attempt to treat it in this way. The majority, however, who oppose the establishment of the university system seem perfectly conscious that the present mode pursued in the higher education is thoroughly false and indefensible, but being for the most part linked in, more or less immediately,

with one or other of the colleges, they seem secretly to hope that things will last as they are *during their time*, and so all considerations of public and future good are merged in the selfish considerations of the present. *Sound* learning and *religious* education are what we want—what, with God's blessing, we mean to have for *this* generation, if it may be—if not, then for the *next*. Our students are just as apt, to say the least, as those of any country in the world. With the same facilities, we believe they will prove even brighter. In no other civilized country has it been found necessary to do away with three-fourths of the acquirements which a university system demands for a degree, and there is no good reason why it should be done in this country. But this is just what we are doing, viz., imparting to students a mere smattering of very ill-digested knowledge, and bestowing thereafter pretentious literary degrees with names of college presidents, professors, and trustees attached. There are but two horns to the dilemma. Either that president and those professors *know* what an education should be, and is, in a literary point of view, everywhere but with us, and owing to them and their like, and then we would not like to characterize their conduct; or else they do *not* know what is meant by an education, and then why do they profess to conduct the highest literary institutions known to our land? This question is a public one; we claim the right to speak freely, and it is with no disposition merely to declaim that we state the facts as they are known to many—may and should be known by all. It would, in any case, be our duty to unmask this pretentious sham, but more especially does it become so when the sham loudly protests that it will not be repressed, that it is *a tolerably good thing, that it will do well enough, that it is impossible to improve it*, that the plan of all ages (and of this, in all other countries), is a *Utopian scheme*. Under such circumstances we must not allow falsehood or ignorance (it must be one or the other that uses the above language), to carry the day, and neither shall, if we can prevent it, stand in the way of a new Catholic and national departure in the cause of higher education in this country. *What man has done, man can do again.* Men do acquire complete literary culture elsewhere, and we fail to do so here. The opportunity, facilities, and stimulus are all that is lacking to us, and we put it to a rational community that we should either procure those means and appliances for our students, or retire vanquished from the higher educational field, but in no case should we retain our present system of delusion and imposture.

There is one feature of the German universities that we should very much like to see introduced into our proposed institution, and that is the division of professors into *Ordinarii*, *Extraordinarii*, and *Privatim Docentes*. Of these, the *Professores Ordinarii* should rank

highest, should select the rector from their own body, should be the sole members of the *Senatus Academicus*, should hold for life, unless resigning, dismissed for grave cause, or retired as hereafter to be provided, in which last case a moderate pension should be provided for the *Professor emeritus*. Professors *extraordinarii* might be appointed as assistants to such ordinary professors as, from the size of their classes, the nature and variety of studies pursued under their oversight, or from other reasons, might, in the judgment of the corporators, stand in need of such auxiliaries. In those branches of study which may be considered desirable of acquisition but which are not inherently essential to a sound education, we suggest that the professors be appointed under the title of *extraordinarii*. These gentlemen should be appointed in the same manner as the *ordinarii*, at a less salary, say by one-third, and should reside in the establishment. Such of them as aid the ordinary professors should have the use of lecture-rooms, apparatus, etc., in such manner as not to interfere with the ordinary lectures, and they should be subject to dismissal or retirement like the *ordinarii*, but in the latter case are not to be entitled to pension. The *Privatum docentes* should be able men of other institutions, or alumni of the University itself, who, having satisfactorily passed such examination on the subjects they propose to teach as the authorities may direct, should obtain license to teach, each his specific subject, to such students as may choose to resort to his lectures, and they should receive no pay from the institution, but simply such fees as may be established by the corporators and voluntarily paid by the students who may attend their course. Such license as *Privatum docens* would, of course, include the use of class-rooms and appliances, which use must be such as to interfere in no respect with their regular occupation by the regular professor. As a rule, subject, of course, to exceptions, the Professor Extraordinarius *assistens* should be considered as first in the line of promotion to the rank of Professor Ordinarius, and the *Privatum docens* to the rank of Professor Extraordinarius. It will be perceived at a glance how these three differently graded classes of instructors will stimulate each other, spur on the students, and advance the objects of the institution. We have the testimony of Matthew Arnold to the beneficial effects thereof, in his late work, entitled *The Higher Schools and Universities in Germany*.

"It is evident how the neighborhood of a rising young *Privat-docent* must keep a *Professor*, ordinary or extraordinary, from getting sleepy or lazy. If he does so, his lecture-room is deserted. The *Privat-docent*, again, has the standard of eminent men before his eyes, and everything stimulates him to come up to it."

The advantages to the student are equally evident. Whatever

spurs on the several professors must, of necessity, inure to the benefit of the student, and there will be hardly any subject on which each student will not have the opportunity of hearing prelections from persons who have made it their special study. We quote from an article in the *Westminster Review* for July, 1875, entitled "Education in Prussia and England."

"To show the completeness to which the lecture system is carried: in a synopsis of the lectures delivered at the University of Berlin, in a winter session, we find no less than one hundred and seventy-five different courses of lectures announced in the *Faculty of Philosophy* alone, including such subjects as Meteorology, Latin Palæography, and Indian Philosophy. In the Faculty of Law there were sixty-two courses, treating every branch of it, from the philosophy of law and psychology of crime down to that of common process. The great ambition of the *Privat-docent* is to reach the professorial chair, which is indeed, in Germany, the culminating point of educational success. And nearly all professors do rise through this *Privat-docent* stage. As the French soldier is said to carry in his knapsack a marshal's baton, so every able and energetic young lecturer in a German university may be said to carry about with him the professorial chalk."

To our view this portion of the German system is a most valuable one. It is not, however, as Mr. Arnold seems to imagine, peculiar to Prussia, since it exists, more or less modified, in the "Circolanti" of the Italian, the "Repetidores" of the Spanish, and the "Instructeurs" of the French course. Since, then, it is good in theory, since common sense recommends it, and it has worked excellently in the most thorough, advanced educational establishments of the world, why should we not introduce it here? Even though it were peculiar to Prussia, *fas est et ab hoste doceri!* All of us have seen the professor, whose appointment dates some ten or fifteen years back, who, perhaps, in the first flush of satisfaction on his appointment, wrote out the notes for a year's course of lectures, which he has yearly droned out unchanged ever since; and all of us know—some, unfortunately, by sad personal experience—what is the effect upon his students!

Just as no one should be admitted to license as *Privatum docens* without a searching examination upon the branch in which he proposes to instruct, so should no one be appointed professor, whether *ordinary* or *extraordinary*, without actually passing a rigid examination in the faculty or science for which he proposes himself as a candidate. For this purpose, as well as for the examination of *privatum docentes* and *matriculandi* (unless the corporators themselves undertake it), a special annual board should be appointed and paid by the corporators. No man should be at any time, or

for any reason, appointed a professor in this institution of ours on account of mere reputation as a scholar—a credit, in our country, often gotten up by a very Barnum-like process and very questionable means—which, when once started, is never examined or tested, the falsity of which few are in a condition to detect, and the retention of which needs no effort, since, once given vogue in the popular notion, it increases like the rolling snowball or the “Fama” of Virgil. These examinations should be announced beforehand, and opportunity afforded for all to attend them who may feel an interest in a matter of such importance to the entire community. Experience daily shows us that the reputation of learning is even more fallacious than estimated or reputed wealth, and that either or both can be, and they very frequently are, false and even fraudulent. It is, therefore, of the utmost consequence that great care should be exercised in the selection of this board, and that its members should do their duty without fear or favor.

A professor, once appointed, should retain his position so long as he might desire *and his usefulness last*. Now, his usefulness might cease *without his fault*, or in sundry ways that need not be described, which suggest themselves readily and require no summary here. In the first case mentioned the professor might be honorably retired; in any of the others there would be no alternative for the corporators but to dismiss him. Any ordinary professor, having served twenty years, might be retired on a pension sufficient for his decent support, and the same pension might, by special vote of the corporators, be granted a professor honorably retired for disability, even though he had not served the allotted time. Should it be evident that a professor fails to interest and advance his class, that reasonable progress is not made by otherwise good classes under his instruction, or that he does not keep himself abreast of his subject, it should always be competent for the corporators to remove him, with or without pension, as they may see fit; but a vote for removal, under these circumstances, must be carried by five-sixths of the corporators voting in the affirmative. A Professor Extraordinary or a Privatum Docens may be dismissed for the same reasons and under the same circumstances as a Professor Ordinary, but neither is in any case entitled to be pensioned. Other legislation would, doubtless, be necessary in many special circumstances and exigencies that would arise; but these are the prominent points now suggesting themselves, which would require to be, as it seems to us, specially provided for in such way and manner that abuse might not arise in the new institution. Any abuse is, in its nature, like the “letting in of waters,” destructive of the objects aimed at, capable of being pleaded as precedent, and impossible of arrest in its course.

As it is above all things important for the professors to know exactly what material they have to work upon, there must be an examination for entrance, which shall assure them not merely that no incapable student is in attendance upon their lectures, but that every one so admitted has fully attained a certain standard of acquirement in the different branches deemed necessary to be reached previous to matriculation at the University. Thus each professor will know to what grade of attainment and meridian of capacity he shall adapt his higher teaching; and without such standard of attainment—which all must necessarily have reached—the instruction of the most energetic and able professor would be in a great degree, and to large numbers of his class, a mere futility. In Germany this is accomplished by the *Abiturienten-examen*, which every young man leaving the *gymnasium* for the university is obliged to pass. Now, in the *prima* or highest gymnasial class there are taught Latin, Greek, Hebrew, German, French, Religion, Psychology, Mathematics, Physics (*Natural Philosophy and Chemistry*), History, and Music. All these are compulsory studies, the greatest attention being paid to the teaching of the classic tongues. English is generally studied, and there is an evident and growing tendency toward making it one of the obligatory studies. The style of examination is such as to test thoroughly the general knowledge of the candidate, and, as it covers the whole ground of school instruction, from *sexta* throughout, it is nearly impossible to prepare for it by a recourse to that system of “cramming” which has been at the English universities, as nearly as may be, reduced to a system. We quote, in proof of the value of this examination, and the standard of acquirement necessary to pass it, the following from the *Westminster Review*, July, 1875, Art. “Education in Prussia and England.”

“One of the most valuable features in these *Abiturienten* examinations consists in the writing of essays *extempore*, one in *German* and one in *Latin*. As an examination, it is in every way of *as high* a standard as the Oxford or Cambridge B.A. pass degree, or the Scotch University M.A., and in some respects of *a considerably higher* standard than either.”

Yet the continental boys who pass this examination, do so for the purpose of entering the university, where, after a few years, and with diligent study, they hope to deserve and be admitted to a degree. The English students (*Englishmen themselves being judges*) have their degrees on considerably less information than the German student requires for matriculation at his university, and we, in this country, inflict our boys on a long-suffering community as Bachelors of Arts, forsooth! with a grade of acquirement that would not pass them from *tertia* to *secunda* in English

public schools, or at all suffice for entrance into *tertia* in a Prussian gymnasium.

Now, we cannot expect that in the outset our students will be prepared for any such examination as the above. It would be absurd to expect it, when we reflect that there has been heretofore no place in the entire United States where such instruction could be acquired, no college where it was imparted. In consequence of this fact, and for some years yet to come, *i. e.*, until the system which we now propose to inaugurate bears fruit and leavens the community, it will be necessary for us to content ourselves with a much lower grade and far less extent of knowledge on the part of our *matriculandi* than we could desire. We must take them as they are, not as we would like to have them or as they ought to be. What standard ought to be insisted on, we can very properly leave to the judgment of the board of examiners. But the constant aim should be to approximate until we finally reach the high standard which the Germans have set us, and, until we shall have done so, it should be clearly published in advance what the requirements of each year will be, so that, knowing absolutely what are the indispensable literary qualifications, as few incompetents as possible may shame themselves and take up the time of the "board" in a hopeless attempt. Until (a thing that may happen in time) a college diploma shall cease to be simply a received bill for four years' board at such an establishment, it can be taken for granted as no proof of any literary acquirements whatever. Whatever be the amount and grade of literary information fixed by the corporators or board of examiners, it should be clearly understood that no one shall, by any possibility, pass, and thereby become entitled to matriculation, unless he be thoroughly informed on all the subjects to the extent set forth in the schedule. We suggest for the first year :

1. Extempore translation into Latin of twenty-five lines of English prose fortuitously dictated, said Latin to be without grammatical blunder. Scansion and prosodical rules for two lines, each, Hexameter and Pentameter; four verses Asclepiadic; one stanza Sapphic; one Strophe Glyconic. Translate into English one chapter Tacitus and twenty lines Juvenal. Four questions in Roman history. Four questions on Roman antiquities.
2. Extempore translation of ten lines of Latin prose (dictated by the examiners) into Greek, without blunder in grammar. Scansion and rules for two lines each Hexameter and Pentameter. Describe the different kinds of Greek Iambic verse. Turn into Latin one section Thucydides; one section Herodotus. Into English, fifteen lines Hesiod. Four questions on Greek history. Four questions on Greek antiquities.
3. Two problems in Surds; two in equations of 2d degree. Explain theory of summation of series. Explain theory of Binomial Theorem. Demonstrate six propositions from Euclid, one problem in plane and one in spherical trigonometry.¹

¹ Although the junior professor of mathematics has these subjects in charge (as by the list of professorships previously given), yet the intention is, that his mode of hand-

4. Twelve questions in modern history. Proximate dates to be always given.
5. English essay, of not less than two and a half pages foolscap, on some subject there assigned, but pertaining to natural theology.

A fair response to these questions, written in presence of the examiners, under their oversight, and without access to books or other assistance, should entitle the candidate to be admitted to matriculation. It is not contended that all these questions must be *fully* answered, or that the responses must be *without mistake*, but that, affixing proportionate numerical values to each question, the board shall value, in conscience, each answer accordingly; and should the sum total of values attached to the answers not amount to three-fourths or four-fifths the sum total of the entire original values attached to the questions, the student presenting said papers cannot be admitted. We should yet, of course, not be equal to the universities of Europe in material; still a very great step in advance would have been made; and the knowledge that the standard of admission has been set high, will, in a few years, cause the colleges to advance proportionately their requirements for admission, and for advance from class to class proportionately. By devoting themselves thus to the cause of education more diligently than most of them have hitherto done, a time may come, we hope soon, when their final examination might be accepted as good *prima facie* evidence of ability and acquirement sufficient to enter the University.

Every academic student should be obliged to attend lectures in *at least* three of the schools, to be selected on his matriculation for the first year, and on signing the laws of the University for each subsequent year. He should pay an annual fee of twenty-five dollars for instruction in each school, and a matriculation fee of ten dollars on entrance. The board should be plain, abundant, and substantial, with no distinction in quality of food for any class or set of persons whatever. All should live together; all study together. One refectory, one dormitory, one lavatory, one study-room should serve all students until increase of numbers might make two, three, or even four of each necessary. Professors alone should have private rooms, and they but one each. To our view these regulations in regard to living seem to be a matter of great importance; but there are many who contend that it is a matter of indifference where the students live, provided only they attend lectures regularly, are ready to answer when called upon, and pass thoroughly their examinations. Foreseeing then, as we do, a prob-

ling the various primary mathematical branches shall be made more thorough and exhaustive than that adopted in the school and college text-books, and that, by his lecturing, the student, who has heretofore but skimmed the surface, shall thoroughly appropriate the *rationale* of these studies which he fancied himself to have completed.

able difficulty in carrying out such regulations, especially when the number of students shall have largely increased, we do not insist on them further than to express our conviction that there is a necessity for entire uniformity in the matter, and that either all students should live within the University, or else none but the divinity students (who, for obvious reasons, must be excepted), should be permitted to do so. It must be admitted, too, that the suggestion of those who do not favor the method of *convictus* almost amounts to argument, when they state that with the preparation necessary to pass the initial examination, there will be none of our students of so immature years or brain as to need the constant superintendence of a prefect; and it is not proposed that there should be lodged in the hands of the *Senatus Academicus* any other punitive powers than those of suspension and expulsion. Suspension will be incurred by the student and inflicted by the *Senatus* for habitual tardiness, persistent want of preparation, or repeated violation of known rule, and dismissal for immoral conduct or whensoever, *by unanimous vote*, the *Senatus* shall indicate their belief that the influence and example of the student are injurious to the University. A second suspension shall be equivalent to expulsion, and no student once expelled shall, under any circumstances, be readmitted.

The mode of instruction should be entirely by lecture, and each professor should deliver *at least* eight lectures weekly, while every student should be obliged to take clear and full notes of every regular university lecture which he attends, and should be ready at any time when called upon by his professor to hand them in for examination. Each professor should devote fifteen or twenty minutes before beginning his lecture to the examination of students casually called upon the subject-matter of the last prelection. In languages there should be in addition two recitations weekly without lecture. Text-books might be recommended on such subjects as absolutely require them, but they should be sparingly used under all circumstances; never (save in the case of the classical authors employed in learning the languages, ancient or modern) brought into the lecture-room, and all care taken that the institution be not made an instrument, either in the hands of booksellers or text-book manufacturers, for their personal gain. Formal religious instruction should be given to all at least twice weekly, in the form of catechetical instruction, while compliance with the commands of the Church should be obligatory.

From the beginning to the end of each session every professor of every grade should mark according to a fixed scale (to be laid down in the code) every shortcoming that he may observe of the students belonging to his special school; marking *conduct, prepara-*

tion, diligence, condition of note-book, etc., each under its own heading. These should be reported weekly to the rector, who, when the demerits of the student shall have reached in the aggregate a certain specific number, shall call the attention of the *Senatus* to the case at its next meeting, when the *Senatus* shall act in the matter. A regular meeting of the *Senatus* shall take place weekly, and it may be convened whenever the rector shall deem it necessary.

No student should be allowed to pass from a lower to a higher class without having passed the examination at the termination of the former; and failure to pass such examination must always necessitate remaining in the same class (in that study) for another year.

The language in which instruction shall be imparted, in the schools of Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Hebrew and Oriental Literature, shall always be Latin; nor shall any student while in attendance on these classes be allowed to ask or answer a question in any other tongue. Latin shall also be the language of the class of Logic. In Moral Philosophy one lecture weekly shall be delivered in Latin, and the professor of Latin shall deliver his weekly lecture on Roman Antiquities in Latin. The professor of Greek, in addition to dictating in Latin all his themes for translation into Greek, shall hold one lecture weekly in the Latin language on Grecian Antiquities. The highest classes in French and German shall receive instruction through the medium of those two languages respectively.

No degree shall be conferred in the three superior faculties of theology, law, or medicine, except that of doctor of these respective faculties. In the academic studies there shall be two degrees. Those who study and pass a final examination upon all the branches pursued under the professors, ordinary and extraordinary, to be entitled *Doctors of Philology*, while those who pass on all the other studies, omitting Hebrew, Sanskrit, Italian, and either French or German, but not both, shall be entitled *Doctors of Science*. No honorary degree, and no degree "*ex speciali gratia*," shall under any circumstances be conferred, nor shall a student be allowed to enter for any of the three superior faculties until he shall have completed a full course in the academic department.

A certificate of attendance on a full course of lectures, on any subject taught in the University, from any teacher of that subject, licensed or otherwise authorized by the University authorities to teach that branch, during any session of the institution, shall, at the close of said session, entitle the student to present himself as candidate at the regular examination on that branch.

Such are a few of the ideas that have seemed to us proper at least to be thought of in connection with this great and noble undertaking, for the accomplishment of which we are not alone in

thinking that the time has fully come. We do not wish to say all that might be urged about the *inscientia quæ quasi ubique in his regionibus grassatur*. To say any more than we have already said might needlessly offend; and our object is to unite all Catholics of the United States, with a view of carrying into effect the pious aspirations expressed by the Bishops of the second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and approved by our Holy Father, the Pope, by founding a Catholic University, which scholars have long felt and all may know to be much needed; a work, the successful carrying out of which will reflect upon the Catholics of this age almost as much credit as does the foundation of this republic upon our farseeing ancestors of a century ago; the successful inauguration of which will (if anything can) prove to our Protestant friends that, so far from eschewing education, we are the genuine fosterers thereof, not in its lowest merely, but also in its highest aspects; and which, unless it be done, and that speedily, we shall find with every year more difficult of performance, until finally genuine and thorough learning will have died out of the land, and we shall have become a nation of sciolists, mistaking words for ideas, rant for reason, and verbosity for logic. We see what other nations have done and are daily performing what we are striving to accomplish, and we know no good reason why our people—we will not say with equal, but with superior natural ability—should not become just as thorough in the scientific, literary, or professional career, as any other nationality whatever. A beginning must be made. Now is the time to make it. We shall never begin younger as a nation! As Catholics again, we appeal to you, not merely because our people want for the champions of their faith and for themselves the best literary preparation to meet the foes of our holy religion, but because in acquiring it we want our young men so girt around with the influences of the Church that there may be no danger, lest, in searching after knowledge, they may be mired in the slough of infidelity, as has heretofore too often happened, in great part owing to the lack of the moral and religious safeguards, which, by this Catholic University, will be afforded them during their whole course of study. Our fervent desire is, that we may yet see it go on in its noble mission, proceeding from strength to strength, conquering and to conquer, until many shall raise their voices in thankfulness to it as having been the means in God's hand of showing them "*the way, the truth, and the life!*"

It is true that the work to be accomplished is of vast proportions; but it being admitted on all hands that a readjustment of the machinery of our higher education must be necessary at some time, and believing, as we do, with many others that it is now high time to set about the work, we should be inexcusable did we not,

at least, make this effort to bring the subject before the Catholic public. An opportunity must primarily be afforded of stating and discussing every point connected with the proposed step, from its inception down to the minutest statute by which professors are to be guided and students to be ruled. For it is on the completeness of our higher instruction that our general civilization depends not merely for its progress, but, what is of still higher importance, for its permanence. We are not, in this country, deficient in general and diffused culture, but we lack concentrated and profound knowledge. There are few subjects of which those who represent literature and science amongst us do not know *a little*. There are unfortunately still fewer, in which that knowledge is so extensive or thorough as to be at all valuable; and no satisfactory provision has yet been made for the fostering of the higher literary and intellectual life. This is what is now proposed, and it is obvious that the establishment of a thoroughly organized system of academic culture must be the first step in attaining that result. Now, the experience of all past ages and the suffrages of the learned of our own day, all point to the university system of education as the only thorough plan for the complete and harmonious development of the human faculties, and for this reason we advocate its establishment among us.

Furthermore, it has been, in all ages, the peculiar mission of the Church to direct and control education; neither can she delegate that duty to other hands. If this were so in ages of faith and in countries entirely and exclusively Catholic, how much more important is it that the mental discipline of her children shall be directed by her in these days and in countries like our own, cankered by infidelity and diseased with heresy? Our institution must then, before all other requirements, be Catholic to the core. Sooner, if there be no other choice, let literature decay, let science perish, let mere intellectual culture disappear from the world, than that one iota of the faith should be diminished, or a single pious practice fall into neglect among men. Now, we look with confidence to the proposed institution as a bulwark to the Catholics of the day and to their children of unborn generations, against both heresy and infidelity, to repress which will be the prime mission of the institution. The intellectual education which it will impart, highly important though it be, is only valuable in so far as it promotes the interests of the Church by panoplying her children against the shafts of her foes, and furnishing them with weapons against those who deny either God's Church, or Him who established her on earth. How all-important then, is it not, that the subject be approached, examined, and discussed in a calm, sedate, and unprejudiced manner; *prayerfully*, that light from on high may be vouchsafed us in

its investigation; *carefully*, that no mistake may be made; and, finally, with an eye single to God's glory and the advancement of His kingdom among mankind?

At the establishment that we have in view the students do not come together to boat, box, practice base-ball, or in any way to cultivate mere muscularity. Their object will be to make themselves thoroughly Christian men, and, at the same time, to procure the most complete mental education, scientific, academic, and secular, that the ablest and best trained Christian minds, with the most ample subsidiary means, and under the most favorable circumstances, can possibly impart to them. Neither must we leave out of view that culture, unperceived at the time but equally important with class instruction and even more lasting in its influences, to the potency of the effects of which Father Newman thus testifies (*Idea of a University*, p. 148):

"Let it be clearly understood, I repeat it, that I am not taking into account moral or religious considerations. I am but saying that that youthful community will constitute a whole, it will embody a specific idea, it will represent a doctrine, it will administer a code of conduct, and it will furnish principles of thought and action. It will give birth to a living teaching which, in course of time, will take the shape of a self-perpetuating tradition or a *genius loci*, as it is sometimes called, which haunts the home where it has been born, and which imbues and forms, more or less and one by one, every individual who is successively brought under its shadow. Thus it is that, independent of direct instruction on the part of superiors, there is a sort of *self-education in the academical institutions of Protestant England, a characteristic tone of thought, a recognized standard of judgment* formed in them, which is developed in the individual who is submitted to it and becomes a twofold source of strength to him both from the distinct stamp it impresses on his mind, and from the bond of union which it creates between him and others, *effects which are shared by the authorities of the place, for they themselves have been educated in it, and are, at all times, exposed to the influence of its ethical atmosphere. Here then is a real teaching whatever be its standards or principles, true or false.* It at least tends toward a cultivation of the intellect; it at least recognizes that knowledge is something more than a mere passive reception of scraps and details; it is a something and it does a something which will never issue from the most strenuous exertions of a set of teachers with no mutual sympathies and no intercommunion; of a set of examiners with no opinions which they dare express, and of no common principles, who are teaching or questioning a set of youths who do not know them and who do not know each other, on a large number of subjects, different in

kind and connected by no wide philosophy, three times a week, or three times a year, or once in three years, in chill lecture-rooms or on a pompous anniversary."

Certainly we do not overrate the importance of the subject in saying that no proposal has, in this century, been laid before American Catholics, the consideration of which is of more consequence and a just decision on which is fraught with results of such magnitude to the Church of these States and to the Faithful as a body. We have, therefore, brought forward the project, and, rather that there might be some definite proposal in favor of or against which to direct future argument, than from any entire conviction on our own part, have made some suggestions which to us seem, at first blush, proper, desirable, and reasonable, but which may strike other minds as lacking in one or all of these qualities. There are Catholics in abundance, both clerical and lay, who thoroughly understand the subject, from the defects of the present to the requirements of the proposed system; and it is from such men that we should like to hear pronounced opinions, whether favorable or unfavorable to the individual views and suggestions embodied in these articles, is a matter of no consequence whatever. What is important, however, is that the subject be fully discussed, and every point thoroughly tested at the bar of the Catholic public opinion of the United States. Thus, and thus only shall we be able to go on (should it be the decision to found a university), understanding from the first what we aim at, where we are in the accomplishment, and what is needed for completion as well as what is to be expected from success. Should, on the other hand, the decision be adverse to our view, we shall be the more ready to acquiesce in the conviction that the Almighty will have furnished to others light not vouchsafed to ourselves.

THE NINE DAYS' QUEEN.

Life of Lady Jane Grey, in English Female Worthies. London, 1833.

Lives of the Tudor Princesses. By Agnes Strickland. London, 1866.

Lives of the Queens of England. By Agnes Strickland. London, 1868.

The Men and Women of the English Reformation. By S. H. Burke. New York, 1871.

THE most superficial student of history can hardly fail to observe that the *heroic* vanishes from royalty, especially female royalty, with the Catholic faith. The great qualities of the Saxon, Norman, and Plantagenet queens of England, for instance, have never been reproduced in their Protestant successors. I speak not of the sainted queens—Protestants have disclaimed sanctity from the beginning. “How dare you mention such persons in my presence?” asked the godly Edward VI., in a rage, when an Anglican prelate, from old habit, swore “by the saints,” before his youthful majesty. Heroic sanctity has never been achieved, or even deemed possible, outside of the one fold whereof Christ is the Shepherd. I speak merely of high courage, extraordinary filial, conjugal, or maternal devotedness, intense patriotism, great penance wherever great faults were to be expiated, and lavish charities to the orphan, the student, the plague-stricken, and the stranger.

There is one lady, however, who at first sight seems to be an exception to all this. She wore a crown for nine days, and the people called her the “Epiphany Queen,” and “The Nine Days’ Wonder.” Although Jane Grey, or, more properly, Jane Dudley, has never awakened in the public mind at large either interest or enthusiasm, yet there is no character in history more completely taken on faith by the few who have written her praises. Her very faults are canonized. Mrs. Sandford¹ told our grandmothers that Jane would not have been so amiable had she been less submissive (*i. e.*, in the matter of usurping her sovereign’s throne). “Her graces,” said she, “like gems whose brilliancy is increased by an opaque setting, gathered strength in her adversity.” Miss Strickland² has exhausted the language of eulogy in describing one whom she affirms to be “the most noble character of the royal Tudor lineage, endowed with every attribute that is lovely in domestic life, while her piety, learning, courage, and virtue qualified her to give lustre to a crown.

¹ *Life of Lady Jane Grey, in English Female Worthies*, vol. I. London: 1833.

² *Lives of the Tudor Princesses.* By Agnes Strickland. London: 1866. Also, *Lives of the Queens of England*, by the same.

“Early wise,” “sweet and saintly,” “peerless,” “heavenly-minded,” “angelic,” “lovely,” “innocent,” “candid,” “divine,” are but a few of the flattering epithets which this celebrated biographer showers upon her youthful heroine. Catholic writers, too, have been fascinated by the qualities with which some have invested her, no less than by her tragic fate. The *Dublin Review*¹ testifies that she “left a loved and honored memory to the world—the memory of a victim, almost a martyr.” A popular essayist and novelist of our day affirms that Jane Grey was incomparably more noble than the two beheaded queens of France, Mary Stuart and Marie Antoinette. “She suffered to the full as deeply as either”—a great mistake—“and yet,” he asks, with evident surprise, “what place has she in men’s feelings and interests compared with theirs?”²

The poets have come to the aid of the essayists, biographers, and historians. The poet laureate of England makes poetic license verge on the impossible in his eloquent description of the saint of his drama :

“ Seventeen—and knew eight languages—in music
Peerless—her needle perfect, and her learning
Beyond the churchmen ; yet so meek, so modest,
So wife-like, humble to the trivial boy,
Mismatched with her for policy ! ”³

And there are few more beautiful passages in English poetry than that which Sir Aubrey de Vere puts into the mouth of Jane, in the parting interview which he imagines between the Duchess of Suffolk and her child, the length of which precludes its insertion here.⁴

Strange it is that the contemporaries of this unfortunate lady were unable to perceive, or unwilling to acknowledge, the existence of these marvellous qualities which have dazzled her modern panegyrists. Her early patroness, Catharine Parr ; her sometimes fellow-student, Edward VI. ; her royal cousins, the Princesses Mary and Elizabeth ; her sisters, Lady Catharine and Lady Mary Grey, all good scholars and ready writers, failed so utterly to be struck with the wonderful, if not miraculous, gifts and graces with which the nineteenth century has invested their hapless relative, that no allusion is made to her erudition or her sanctity in their letters, memoirs, or journals. I cannot find any evidence that she was loved or revered by a single contemporary, even of her own or her husband’s family. If I am wrong, some one will have the goodness to enlighten me, but I really find little to support Jane’s fame as a

¹ October No., 1875.

² Justin McCarthy, in *Modern Leaders*, article on the Empress Eugenie. New York : 1872. Shelden & Co.

³ *Queen Mary. A Drama.* By Alfred Tennyson. London : 1875.

⁴ Ascham’s *Schoolmaster*.

scholar, save the rather interested testimony of Roger Ascham, while her title to sanctity has been manufactured by no less a personage than the veracious martyrologist, Fox.¹ Indeed, if Jane's contemporaries were of the same opinion as her admirers of to-day, she would certainly have figured as a Protestant saint—a distinction to which she was fully as well entitled as her handsome, deceitful relative, King Charles, "the Martyr," sole incumbent of the Protestant calendar.

Even the boy-king, Edward VI., whose wife Jane was brought up to be, was perfectly insensible to her charms, and indignantly spurned the idea of marrying a subject,² saying he would have a foreign princess, "well stuffed and jewelled." He was actually engaged to the Princess Elizabeth of France, for some months previous to his premature death.

Mary Tudor was one of the most thorough and elegant scholars that ever graced a throne. In point of years she might have been Jane's mother. Much intercourse took place between the cousins, and Mary, both as princess and as queen, showed great and constant kindness to the cadet branches of her family. Yet so far as I can discover, there is no evidence that this learned princess ever perceived in her cousin the uncommon intellectual endowments and saint-like virtues, the mere recital of which charms posterity. That Mary was not insensible to extraordinary ability is proved by the fact that, even amid the stormy scenes of her early maiden reign, she found time to examine and correct the Latin exercises of another cousin, related to her in exactly the same degree as Jane, the boy-prodigy Darnley, who is allowed to have entirely surpassed the far-famed progress of his cousins, Edward VI., Queen Elizabeth, and Lady Jane Grey.³

By their deeds, rather than by the speeches and sentiments attributed to them by partisan writers, ought the men and women of history to rise or sink in our estimation; and the more virtue they can be proved to possess, the more pleasing the task of the biographer. But truth ought to be the first ingredient of history; nor can a good cause be really advanced by falsehood. An excellent authority affirms that for the last three centuries history has been little else than a conspiracy against truth. The lies of history during that

¹ Fox's Book of Martyrs.

² Edward Sixth's Journal. This prince was himself the son of a private gentlewoman, the detestable Jane Seymour, which connection gave the youthful majesty of England very near relations named Smith, one of his mother's sisters having chosen a husband of that homely name. Another of that queen's sisters was married to one Cromwell, grandson to a blacksmith at Putney. The haughty young Tudor had already more kin of low degree than he cared to acknowledge.

³ Life of Lady Margaret Douglas, who, through her son Darnley, husband of Mary Stuart, is ancestress of almost every royal house in Europe.

period have been chiefly in the interest of Protestantism, and with what results? Protestantism was never less respectable than it is to-day; its brightest minds, its purest hearts, have sought and continue to seek rest in the maternal bosom of the Unchangeable Church. We will endeavor to give in these pages all that remains of an acknowledged Protestant heroine when fact is separated from rhetoric, the sober, historical truth,—so far as it can be discerned at this distant period,—of a youthful lady of demi-royal descent, who would probably have left no “footprints in the sands of time,” during Queen Mary’s¹ reign, had she not usurped a throne, and, as a consequence of her temerity, mounted a scaffold.

The grandmother of Lady Jane Grey is celebrated in contemporary chronicles as the fairest princess in Europe. Born towards the close of the fifteenth century, Mary Tudor, youngest surviving child of Henry VII. and Elizabeth of York, was, at the age of ten, affianced to the Archduke Charles of Austria, afterwards the renowned Charles V. At sixteen she married the mature widower, Louis XII., King of France, who, dying in less than three months, left her a not very disconsolate widow. Charles Brandon, a favorite of her brother, Henry VIII., was dispatched to France for the purpose of escorting the princess to England; but was previously obliged to take a solemn oath before the king and the all-powerful Wolsey, that “he would not abuse his trust by any particular manifestation of partiality towards the young queen consigned to his guardianship.”

Oaths, vows, or promises were never deemed very sacred by that handsome miscreant. Undeterred by the fact that two or three living ladies² claimed him as a husband, he broke his oath at the earliest opportunity; the marriage ceremony was performed over himself and the royal widow of six weeks, in Paris, February 12th, 1515. As Brandon had been domesticated in her father’s family from infancy, and is said to have been the first object of her girlish devotion, the princess could not have been ignorant of his matrimonial entanglements. And even if she were, her virtuous sister-in-law took care to send a special messenger to Paris to warn her that the captivating Suffolk was not free to contract matrimony anew. Indeed, a recent writer³ has severely censured the Spanish queen for endeavoring to prevent this iniquitous connection. But this person, so far from being able to write history, is incapable of

¹ Had Jane lived to the next reign, she would certainly have been persecuted by Queen Elizabeth, as her sisters Catharine and Mary were.

² He deserted his first wife, a daughter of Sir Anthony Browne, and married her cousin, Lady Mortimer. The Church compelled him to return to his lawful wife. His third venture was the heiress of Lord Lisle, by whom he had his title, Viscount Lisle.

³ W. H. Dixon, in *History of Two Queens*.

giving a truthful description of a famous city¹ which he travelled thousands of miles to see and examine.

The mother of Lady Jane Grey was Frances, eldest daughter of Charles Brandon and Mary Tudor. For the reasons already given, it was often argued that the crown could not descend through this lady. Her sister, Lady Eleanor² Brandon, however, was universally allowed to be of legitimate birth; the claimants on her father's hand probably died before she was born, although it was not till 1529, that Cardinal Wolsey had the marriage of the princess with Suffolk confirmed.

Henry Grey, Marquis of Dorset, was the father of Jane. Grey repudiated his wife, Catharine Fitzalan, daughter of the Earl of Arundel, to form a more lofty alliance with a niece of Henry VIII., a crime which the deserted wife's kindred avenged when Grey's daughter usurped the throne. Grey was not royally descended, as his pensioner Ulmer,³ a German Reformer, erroneously states. As soon as monastic spoils began to be scattered among the greedy courtiers of Henry VIII., Dorset became, as Ulmer writes, "the thunder-bolt and terror of the Papists, their fierce and terrible adversary."⁴

This Grey was about as wicked as his slender ability would permit; a bad son, a bad husband, a bad father, a bad subject. It is said that the churchmen of those times were reluctant politicians; the king being obliged to seek their services owing to the ignorance, incapacity, and drunkenness of the nobles; and Suffolk and Dorset, grandfather and father of Jane, are particularized among such nobles as being "almost illiterate."⁵ They are not, therefore, invested even with the interest that often attaches to clever rogues. There is no evidence that Frances Brandon surpassed her worthless mate in intellectual endowments, education, or moral rectitude; or rather there is abundant evidence that she did not. Judging by the letters which remain, the Queen-Duchess herself had far more intellect than her immediate descendants. Some of the best of these are addressed to her redoubtable brother, Henry VIII.:

¹ Americans who have come across this gentleman's description of Salt Lake City will credit him with a rather lively imagination. Mr. McCarthy remained almost as long in that capital as Mr. Dixon, but could see nothing of the beauties out of which the latter made the larger part of a volume. "Oh, Hepworth Dixon," he exclaims, after a careful survey of the morally and physically filthy capital of Mormondom, "how could you write so about its theatre? Or was the beautiful temple of the drama which *you* saw here deliberately taken down, and did they raise in its place the big, gaunt, ugly, dirty, dismal structure which *I* saw, and in which I and my companions made part of a dreary dozen or two of audience, and blinked in the dim, depressing light of mediæval oil lamps?"—*Mr. McCarthy on Brigham Young, in Galaxy.*

² See Life of Lady Margaret Clifford, daughter of Eleanor Brandon, who claimed precedence of the sisters of Lady Jane Grey, as being of legitimate descent.

³ Zurich Letters.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Burke's Men and Women of the English Reformation, vol. i.

"My most dearest and right entirely beloved lord and brother," and subscribed, "Your loving swster, Mary, Queen of France."

This princess is that "Mary bright of hue" whom Sir Thomas More represents the dying Elizabeth of York praying God to make "virtuous, wise, and fortunate." This prayer was not granted, though we may well hope that the follies of her early years were expiated by the sorrows and sufferings amid which she closed her short and troubled life. Queen Elizabeth of York has been highly eulogized by almost all historians for her graces and virtues. Her biographers style her "Elizabeth the Good." But if this royal lady were to be judged by her children who reached maturity—Margaret, Queen of Scotland, a woman of scandalous life, Henry VIII., and Mary, the Queen-Duchess, her character as a mother would scarcely stand very high.

It is not from parents such as we have described that saints or scholars usually spring. The Lady Jane Grey did not certainly inherit the virtues and abilities with which her eulogists invest her. We shall see that she was little more fortunate in her friends, companions, and tutors, who were, for the most part, mere sycophants of the party in power for the moment, apostates, church-robbers, and friars of infamous life, who gloried in their shame, and whose greatest boast was that they had made vows to the Most High and violated them.

It is not perhaps the most gracious task in the world to take down from its pedestal a popular idol; and such a few of our contemporaries have sought to make the Lady Jane Grey. Her memory as a Protestant saint and martyr is endeared to the Protestant mind—though she was rather a Calvinist than a Protestant—and her tragic fate has shrouded her with a lurid glare which some have mistaken for the aureola of sanctity.

The history of Lady Jane Grey has several points of resemblance with that of her cousin, Arabella Stuart, who married a descendant of Jane's sister, Lady Catharine Grey. Both—one through Mary Tudor, one through Margaret Tudor—were great-granddaughters of Henry VII., and their demi-royal descent caused their ruin. The elder Disraeli¹ might have said of Jane what he says of Arabella: "She is said to have been beautiful, and not to have been beautiful; her very portrait, ambiguous as her life, is neither the one nor the other."

No chronicler has deemed it worth while to give the date of Jane's birth,² so far as we have been able to discover. Her pictures

¹ Curiosities of Literature, vol. iii.

² Lingard mentions Jane as sixteen and as seventeen, in the last year of her life. Hist. England, vol. vii. Fuller says she was eighteen. Holy State, p. 311. Miss Strickland says she was born in October, 1537, and later on, that she was exactly fourteen in May, 1551!

would lead to the belief that she was born several years earlier than the period usually assigned. Her age at the time of her usurpation of the throne, July, 1553, is variously given as sixteen, seventeen, and eighteen. In a letter from Ulmer to Bullinger, dated April, 1550, Jane is stated to be about fourteen years of age. If this be correct, she must have been born in 1536; and there is every reason to believe that this is correct, as Ulmer was domesticated with her father at Bradgate, and might easily have heard from Jane herself or from her parents, her exact age. She could scarcely have been born earlier, as her parents were married in March, 1533, and Jane's birth was preceded by those of a brother and sister who died in infancy. It may well be that Jane was born about the time of the disgrace of the unfortunate Anne Boleyn,¹ and the exaltation of her vile rival; and that as her parents were peculiarly given to deserting the setting and worshipping the rising sun, they called their infant *Jane*, to compliment the triumphant beauty whose star was then in the ascendant.

Bradgate, in Leicestershire, is universally allowed to have been the place of Jane's birth. Fuller thus describes it: "This fair, large, and beautiful palace was erected in the early part of the reign of Henry VIII., by Thomas Grey, second Marquis of Dorset. It is built principally of red brick, of a square form, with a turret at each corner." Bradgate must indeed have been one of the fairest homes in England. Its ruins may be traced to-day, in a rural spot of exquisite beauty, five miles from the town of Leicester. A tower still stands which local tradition points out as the birthplace of the nine-days' Queen.

The early days of Jane are involved in the completest obscurity. Who baptized her? Who held her at the font? What were the first religious impressions she received? Did she ever make her first communion? Was she ever confirmed? At what period was she transferred from the nurse to the governess? Had she ever a governess? At what time did Aylmer become her tutor? These particulars elude all our research. We know, however, that she to have been about two years younger than her more celebrated was not long alone in her nursery. Lady Catharine Grey is said sister; while the youngest child of Henry Grey and Frances Brandon, Lady Mary Grey, was not born till 1545, when her sister was about nine years old.

¹ Anne Boleyn was beheaded a little after noon, May 19th, 1536; the royal widower of a few hours married Jane Seymour on the morning of the 20th. The reformers vied with each other in doing honor to the successor of their murdered patroness. In the dedication of Coverdale's Bible, the names *Henry* and *Anne* were introduced, but as Anne was beheaded between the printing and the publication, J for *Jane* was printed over the letters which composed the name Anne, and the wife-killer associated with the new object of his caprice, on the fly-leaves of the Bible.

The first glimpse history gives us of the "divine Jane" is in 1546, when we find her installed into some office about the person of Henry VIII.'s last Queen, Catharine Parr. She had, therefore, all the advantages likely to accrue from being frequently in the presence of her royal grand-uncle, when that degraded monarch was at his very worst; which certainly was after his marriage with his Protestant queen. The fact that Catharine Parr accepted the sixth reversion of the bloody hand of Henry VIII. a short time after the death of her second husband, his lawful wife, Anne of Cleves, being yet alive, is sufficiently eloquent of her character. The first part of one of Luther's descriptions¹ of the first Anglican Pope was never more true than at this period. He was sunk so low, that his sister-in-law, who subsequently stood in the same relation to Catharine, says truly "that no lady that stood on her honor would venture on him." When he proposed for Christina, Duchess of Milan, that princess informed him, with infinite scorn, that if she had two heads she would place one at the disposal of his majesty.

It has been stated that Jane was much in the company of Catharine Parr. This lady had become a disciple of the "new learning" during her second widowhood, and was intimate with most of the reformers, who were accustomed to meet at her house. There is little doubt that her conversion to the "godliness" of the age was due to her love for Sir Thomas Seymour, one of the leaders of the anti-Catholic party, and subsequently her fourth husband. Perhaps, too, Jane's Protestantism was partially confirmed by her love of the handsome Edward Seymour, whom she frequently met at court,² and to whom, with the consent of her parents, she was contracted at an early age. I think it certain that neither Henry VIII. nor his son ever thought of her as the future queen-consort. Henry's latter years were spent in carrying fire and sword into Scotland, to seize the person of its infant queen, Mary Stuart, for the bride of his heir-apparent. This scheme was given up only when Mary was contracted to the dauphin; after which Edward was betrothed to that prince's sister, Elizabeth of France.

We know not the date of Jane's residence at court, nor the length of time it continued; but we have some idea of the kind of persons whom she met there; and we know that her house at Bradgate was the rendezvous of the most infamous men that ever disgraced Christianity. No doubt she oscillated between the court and Bradgate. Her father constituted himself a sort of protector-general to a set of vile wretches, who, having appalled their own people by their crimes, came to hapless England to reform the Church:

¹ "Luther called Henry VIII. 'the grossest of all pigs,' which he probably was, and 'of all asses,' which he certainly was not."—*My Clerical Friends*—MARSHALL.

² He was usually in attendance on Prince Edward, his cousin-german.

"With every crime they stocked the nation,
To fit it for a reformation."¹

Of these divines and their English compeers, the acute Bishop Doyle² says : "If these men have reconstructed the Church on the foundations of the prophets and apostles, the Manichean system must be true, and the evil principle has prevailed over the good." "They were," says Dr. Littledale, a Protestant clergyman of our day, "utterly unredeemed villains."³

The first Christians sold their lands and gave the money to the Apostles for the poor; the "reformed" English—especially Jane's relatives—stole the goods of the poor to enrich themselves, and created that terrible evil unknown in the Ages of Faith, and with which no power but the Church has ever been able successfully to grapple—*pauperism*—that word so hideous in the mouth of a Christian. Jane's grandfather, Brandon,⁴ was infamous even among the courtiers of Henry VIII., as the suppressor of thirty monasteries. Her mother, with a rapacity truly worthy of a niece of Henry VIII., contrived to become mistress of almost all the Carthusian property in and about London. The first Christians had but one heart and one soul; no two of the reformers, English or foreign, agreed on a single doctrine.

Historians have spoken of Henry's queen as Catholic or as Protestant. The truth is, his queens and his courtiers were of the religion, or phase of religion, which the new pope dictated. Not one of them, after the saintly Catharine of Aragon, ever dared to oppose his will. If they had done so, they might have prepared for martyrdom; and the spirit of martyrdom in his wives died with his Spanish queen. It is, however, certain that, with the exception of Catharine Parr, who died delirious, all the women whom the royal pope married sought to be reconciled to the Catholic Church when death approached. Henry, indeed, kept the title⁵ he had won in his young and glorious days, but, as in the case of Queen Victoria,⁶ his successor as "Head of the Church," it might be asked : Of *what* faith was he "Defender?" Jane knew well that he tied Catholics and Protestants to the same stake. Poor Charlotte Bronté, in her strictures on Julia Kavanagh's *Women of Christianity*, says that "Protestantism is a quieter creed than Romanism—it does not set up its good women for saints, canonize their names, and proclaim their good works." I am afraid the quietness of Protestantism in this

¹ Ward's *Cantos*.

² Life of Dr. Doyle, Fitzpatrick.

³ Lecture on "The Characters of the First English Reformers."

⁴ He died while Catharine Parr was queen, leaving two sons of his last wife.

⁵ Defender of the Faith.

⁶ The question was recently put, in Parliament : "Of *what* faith is Queen Victoria defender?"

respect is akin to the quietness of death ; and its creed, being as uncertain to-day as in the days of the first Anglican pope, Miss Bronté, though eldest daughter of one parson, and first wife of another, did not undertake to explain.

The Lady Jane Grey could not have been long at court without learning that her patroness, Queen Catharine Parr, was ambitious to add the higher crown of authorship to her matrimonial diadem. The work by which this lady sought admission among royal authors contains several passages worthy of the picturesque right hand of Cranmer :

“ Thanks be given to the Lord that He hath now sent us such a godly and learned king, in these latter days, to reign over us, that, with the force of God's word, hath taken away the veils and mists of error, and brought us to the knowledge of the truth by the light of God's word. . . . Our Moses, and most godly wise governor and king, hath delivered us out of the captivity and spiritual bondage of Pharaoh. I mean by this Moses King Henry VIII., my most sovereign favorable lord and husband, one (if Moses had figured any more than Christ), through the excellent grace of God, meet to be another expressed verity of Moses's conquest over Pharaoh (and I mean by this Pharaoh the bishop of Rome), who hath been, and is, a greater persecutor of all true Christians than ever was Pharaoh of the children of Israel.”

The woman who could apply such gross flattery to Henry VIII., “ the impersonation of evil,” as that monarch is aptly styled by Mackintosh,¹ was a fitting nursing-mother for the “ miserable apostasy ”² known in history as the Reformation.

The youthful Jane knew perfectly well the vicious and cruel character of the crowned wretch whom her patroness thus flattered. She knew that he had murdered his late queen, “ a very little girl,”³ of sixteen or seventeen ; and still more recently butchered his aged relative, Margaret Plantagenet, who, with the lion-like spirit of her dauntless race, refused to lay her aged head on the traitor's block, and bade his minions “ take it as they could.”⁴ Jane was

¹ English Hist., vol. ii. ² Baring Gould. ³ *Parvissima puella.* Hilles.

⁴ Prescott rather innocently observes, in his Charles V., vol. iii., with reference to the Marian persecutions : “ The English being *remarkable for the mildness of their public executions* (!), beheld, with astonishment and horror, venerable persons condemned to endure torments to which their laws did not subject even the most atrocious criminals.” The fact is, there was not one *illegal* execution in Mary's reign. Parliament made the laws, and the queen allowed them to take effect. That is *her* share in the persecutions that disgraced her reign. But, verily, no style of killing could be a novelty after the days of the royal Bluebeard. The Countess of Salisbury was hacked to pieces, Anne Askew and many others were racked and burned ; several were boiled to death at Smithfield. See *Gray Friars' Chronicle*, printed for the Camden Society, 1852. Father Middlemore's flesh was torn off with red-hot pincers, the heartless persecutors searching

old enough to remember these, and a hundred other instances of his demoniac cruelty. How it must have blunted her sense of justice to hear such a monster flattered. As to her moral training, she was certainly worse off at the court of such a woman than she would have been with her unprincipled parents.

The interest which Catharine Parr took in the young Jane Grey must be considered in connection with the darling project of that queen, who desired to perpetuate her influence over the future monarch of England by providing him with a wife in the person of his cousin. If Jane possessed a tithe of the qualities and fascinations with which posterity has endowed her, she ought to have won the heart of the princely boy. But, poor girl, scarcely one of those who knew her, loved her; and yet her still more unfortunate contemporaries, Mary Tudor and Mary Stuart, had qualities to evoke in those about them the most passionate attachment.

When Catharine Parr was in serious danger of being added to the list of Henry's conjugal victims, 1546, we find Jane in attendance on her person. Jane must have learned on this perilous occasion how deeply the queen was attached to the Reformed doctrines, when that frightened mother of the Reformation saved her head by disclaiming all theological knowledge but that of which the royal wife-killer was the exponent. When Catharine visited her terrible master on the evening of the day which had almost proved fatal to her, Lady Jane Grey¹ is mentioned as carrying the lights before her mistress, a ceremony during which etiquette required that the candle-bearer should walk backwards, facing the queen.

Catharine and her ladies had been borrowing books of an unfortunate lady who had recently left her husband, to preach some new gospel. When Anne Askew was condemned to death, the queen

for his heart, which the martyr told them was "in Heaven, where his treasure was." "The executioner," says Pole, "suspended the embraces of that fell tyrant, Death, and thus prolonged the sufferings of his victims." The common punishment for treason—and every one knows how easily treason was committed under Henry VIII.—was so horrible that nothing more dreadful could be devised. Some forty years later than the period of which we write, Queen Elizabeth was so exasperated by the Babington conspiracy (1586) for the rescue of the Queen of Scots, that she ordered her Council to invent "some new device" to punish its perpetrators. But Burleigh informed Her Majesty "that the punishment prescribed by the letter of the law was to the full as terrible as anything new that could be devised, if the executioner took care to protract the extremity of their pains in the sight of the multitude."—*Letters of Burleigh to Hatton*. LINGARD. Does Prescott write in ignorance or in malice? As to venerable persons, the English mob never saw any more venerable than More, Fisher, and the Carthusian monks, whose prior, F. Haughton, was hanged till half dead, disembowelled while yet alive, his heart cast into the fire, his trunk divided into four pieces, and when half roasted sent to the four most important cities in the kingdom! O, Prescott, shame!

¹ Speed's Chronicle.

and her party were terror-stricken lest the poor fanatic might mention them as her disciples. But with a nobility of soul which deserved a better fate, Anne guarded their secret even on the rack. Henry was terribly incensed against this young woman, who did not protest exactly in his way, for "having brought prohibited books into his palace and imbued his queen," and his nieces, whom he unceremoniously calls "Suffolk's daughters," with her doctrine. This passage would seem to show that Jane's mother and aunt, Lady Frances and Lady Eleanor Brandon, the Marchioness of Dorset, and the Countess of Cumberland, were at court at this time, and that both were disciples of the hapless lady who became the scapegoat for the royal party.

Anne Askew was burned alive. There is no evidence that her royal friend interceded for her, or indeed for any other "martyr." In the very midst of her sombre honeymoon, a period at which she must have had some influence, three Sacramentarians were roasted alive at Smithfield. Indeed the worst of Henry's bad acts were perpetrated during the queenship of Catharine Parr. Meanwhile, it is probable that Jane oscillated between the court and the residence of her parents. With all the changes and distractions of a court life, and frequent travelling hither and thither, Jane's opportunities of acquiring learning were not by any means propitious. The awful death of her redoubtable great-uncle, Henry VIII., in January, 1547, wrought a great change in her position and prospects. Whether Jane was at court or with her parents at this period, we have no means of ascertaining. It is certain that Catharine Parr was not present when Henry's appalling death-scene was enacted; and it is just possible that Jane attended her in her retirement; in which case that youthful lady must have been edified to see that the royal widow engaged herself to contract her fourth marriage, and probably contracted it, while the colossal remains of the first Anglican pope were still above ground.

The will of Henry VIII.,¹ the provisions of which were said to be known only to his council and his queen, placed Jane² immediately after his daughters, Mary and Elizabeth, in the royal succession, entirely passing over the posterity of his weak and vicious eldest sister, Margaret Tudor. Hence, there was a distant prospect that Jane might be a queen-regnant, if not a queen-consort.

The death of Henry VIII. was "very evil." He continued his

¹ "Considerable doubt was entertained of the authenticity of the will attributed to Henry VIII. Under Mary it was pronounced spurious by the privy council; by Elizabeth it was never suffered to be mentioned."—LINGARD.

² "The heirs *masles* of the Lady Frances," and failing these, of the Lady Eleanor, "but," says honest old Spelman, "the name of Brandon was clean put out in the second generation," hence the crown was to revert to female heirs.

tyrannies to the very last.¹ Harpsfield and Saunders mention that the dying monarch evinced an ardent desire to be reconciled with the Church, which he had so barbarously persecuted. But Henry had slaughtered, or driven far from him, every ecclesiastic who would have dared to tell him the truth. The murderer of More, and Fisher, and Forest, and Abell—the wretch who had made the blood of God's saints flow like water—deserved to hear the truth no more. His gigantic corpse remained above ground from January 28th till late in February. On its way to Windsor, it was laid for the night among the broken walls of Linn, the prison of the young queen whom he had murdered exactly five years before, and then were the awful words of Friar Peyton verified, who had compared him to Achab, and told him to his face from Greenwich pulpit, "that the dogs would in like manner lick his blood." Blood oozed from the body and saturated the pavement of the dismantled church, and when the plumbers came to solder the royal coffin, they found a dog beneath it, which lapped up the blood of the relentless tyrant.²

Save the mother that bore him and the wife who glorified his early days of kingship, no woman ever loved Henry VIII., except his daughter Mary. The boy-king severely censured her for the filial grief with which she bitterly bewailed his woful end. The crown consoling him for the loss of such a father, he commanded his subjects to dry their tears—a command which they could not obey for a very obvious reason. In his capacity of Head of the Church, the pope of nine summers informed the public in general, that "a prince who led so holy a life, and governed his people with such justice as Henry VIII.," was sure of going straight to heaven; and was, in fact, now enjoying eternal happiness.³ The troublesome and tedious ceremonies of canonization were entirely dispensed with.

Henry left two widows, his Lutheran queen, Anne of Cleves, who was living in retirement at Richmond, and ultimately became a fervent Catholic; and his Protestant queen, who had already provided herself with a mate, no other than Thomas Seymour, the vilest profligate of a most licentious court. Strype informs us, that she rather courted him, than he her;⁴ and in one of her letters she tells him that she would have married him after the death of his second spouse, had not the king stepped between them. It will be remembered that it was during her second widowhood, of two or three months at most, that she adopted the views of the

¹ "Surrey of the deathless lay," was his last victim, and the tyrant's death alone prevented the execution of the father of the poet, the aged Duke of Norfolk, and of Catharine Parr herself.

² MSS. Harl.

³ Burnet, *The Sloan Collection, etc.*

⁴ *Ecclesiastical Memorials.*

Reformers, and it can scarcely be doubted that Seymour's handsome face and dashing figure were the agreeable medium through which this change was wrought in the religious sentiments of this gay widow, who was anything but a "widow indeed."

Lady Jane Grey seems to have been with her parents during the courtship and clandestine marriage of her late mistress, for we find that as soon as the marriage was made public, namely, about three months after the burial of the late king, Sir Thomas Seymour¹ offered to purchase the wardship of Jane from her parents, he and his wife being determined to marry her, if possible, to the young king, and thus perpetuate their influence over their sovereign. The parents of Jane readily acceded to this proposal. The guardianship of their daughter was transferred, "for a consideration," from them to Seymour, and Jane was again domesticated with Catharine Parr.

Seymour had a double object² in wedding the frolicsome widow of his late master. 1. The acquisition of the wealth which this prudent lady had accumulated while queen, and of the dowers which she enjoyed as widow of two wealthy lords and a king. 2. To gain more easy access to Catharine's step-son, the new king, and win him over to his purposes. The chief of these purposes was to thwart his brother, the Protector, who had just helped himself to the royal title of Duke of Somerset, and who was eager to marry his daughter, Lady Jane Seymour, to the young king. The bold move of the bridegroom, in obtaining possession of the person of Lady Jane Grey, and purchasing the right to marry her to whom he would, checkmated Edward Seymour most provokingly, and fanned the flame of enmity already kindled between the ambitious brothers.

One circumstance rendered Catharine Parr's residence most unsuitable for the virtuous bringing up of a young woman. The princess Elizabeth was domesticated with her step-mother from the time of her father's death. Here, indeed, the child was the mother of the woman. How could Jane Grey escape contagion in such companionship? Elizabeth Tudor, in her fifteenth year, was what she had not ceased to be in her seventieth year, a bold, bad woman. So far as can be ascertained, Seymour was the first, and certainly not the least infamous, of Elizabeth's lovers. The fact that he was brother to one of her father's wives, and husband of another—that he was brother to the woman for whose sake her mother had been sent to the block—did not in the least deter Elizabeth. The fact

¹ Deposition of Jane's father, the Marquis of Dorset, Tytler's Reigns of Edward and Mary.

² Pictorial History of England, a voluminous compilation by Craik and Macfarlane, vol. ii., book v.

that Elizabeth was an orphan, a daughter of his late king, and sent to his wife for protection, did not deter Seymour. Mary endeavored to draw her sister from the ill-regulated household of Catharine Parr, by offering her a home with herself, on the ostensible plea that the queen-dowager had outraged their father's memory by her hasty, indecorous marriage; but there is little doubt that the daughter of Catharine of Aragon knew exactly how matters stood, and endeavored to save the reputation of the daughter of Anne Boleyn by withdrawing her from temptation. But Elizabeth preferred the freedom of her present home.

These disgraceful amours utterly ruined the character of Elizabeth, and rendered miserable the life of Seymour's wife, who was finally compelled to send the princess from her house, a few months before her death, which occurred in September, 1548. Elizabeth is the only unmarried princess of England whose conduct was investigated by the royal council, and who was compelled to write a "Confession" of her misdeeds while yet a mere girl. It would seem that intercourse between the vicious pair was not quite broken up by separation. "It is probable," says Miss Strickland, "that the alarming change in Catharine"—after the birth of her only child—"was caused by the whispers in her lying-in chamber relating to her husband's passion for her step-daughter, and his intention of aspiring to the hand of the princess, in case of her own decease."¹ Nobody seems to have dreamt of removing the youthful Jane Grey from the contamination of such surroundings. Her parents thought more of the money the sale of her wardship brought them than of the morality of their child, then at the tender age of twelve. Surely, Seymour's house was a model house; it was filled with English and foreign reformers, who held divine service therein two or three times a day. "Seymour,"² says Latimer, "gets him out of the way when the daily prayer begins, like a mole digging in the earth." Verily he was not so much of a hypocrite as those who attended the daily prayer and led such vicious lives.

Poor Catharine was happier even in the lifetime of Henry VIII. She was not then tormented by jealousy, and she could resort to her literary labors, such as they were. "She spent her own leisure hours in compiling into the form of prayer the inspirations of a diseased brain."³ Never had an ill-used wife greater need of prayer. Lady Jane Grey remained in her household to the end. Having given birth to a daughter, the queen died delirious eight days later. The Lady Jane officiated as chief mourner at her funeral. Sir Thomas brought her to Hanworth after his wife's funeral, and such was the favorable impression she made on the

¹ Life of Catharine Parr.

² Audin's Life of Henry VIII.

² Latimer's Sermons, first edition.

heartless widower, that he deliberated which he would select for his next wife, the Princess Elizabeth, or the Lady Jane Grey.

It would be strange indeed if the youthful Jane acquired either virtue or learning in so poor a school as the ill-regulated household of Catharine Parr. Neither could daily intercourse with Seymour, Elizabeth, and the immoral apostates on whom Seymour's wife lavished her friendship, have been at all beneficial to so young a lady. If Jane were "truthful and conscientious,"¹ she could have had but little real respect for her much-married patroness,² whose duplicity she knew to be perfect. She was aware, too, that it was not the virtuous indignation of the Christian matron, but the jealousy of the neglected wife, that the scandalous behavior of her wicked husband and her shameless step-child awoke in the breast of this unfortunate lady.

Seymour desired at first to send Jane home to her parents, but he speedily changed his mind and wrote a second letter to her father, in which he evinces the greatest anxiety to keep her. Elizabeth was now perfectly willing to marry this bold, bad man, if the consent of the council could be obtained. To act without this would invalidate her title to the crown. That Jane did not very strongly reprobate the heartless conduct of this worthy pair to her late patroness, may be inferred from the fact that she continued on excellent terms with both.

The answer of Jane's father to Seymour is a remarkable production. "It bears,"³ says Miss Strickland, "no token of the imbecility of mind, under which his partisans have been driven to shield the reproach of his vices." But it not unfrequently happens that persons who are imbecile as to honor, uprightness, truth, and virtue, are wonderfully quicksighted and clear-headed when there is question of making money.

After many thanks and flatteries, Dorset goes on:

"Considering the state of my daughter and her tender years, wherein she shall hardly rule herself without a guide, lest she should, for want of a bridle, take too much head, and conceive such an opinion of herself, that all such good behavior as she heretofore hath learned by the queen's and your most wholesome instructions should either altogether be quenched in her, or, at least, much diminished, I shall in most hearty wise require your lordship to commit her to the guidance of her mother, by whom, for the fear and duty she oweth her, she shall be more easily framed

¹ Strickland.

² While Catharine Parr was queen she used to attend Mass with the king in the morning and hold Protestant worship privately, her own chaplains officiating at both. Jane must have often shared as well as witnessed her deceit, as she was sometimes in attendance on her person.

³ Tudor Princesses.

and ruled towards virtue, which I wish above all things to be plentiful in her."¹

Here follow allusions to the necessity of putting Jane under the "eye and oversight of her mother" and "the addressing of her mind to humility, soberness, and obedience," which would seem to show that she was not exempt from the faults and foibles of other girls. Jane was now in her thirteenth year. If she had borne anything of the repute of a saint her father would not have written in this strain. His object was not, however, to get his daughter home and place her under his wife's tutelage, but to drive a better pecuniary bargain. His wife, actuated by the same base motives, joined in her husband's request, and Jane was returned to her parents. But it was no part of their policy to keep her. Their letters to Seymour bear the date of September 19th, and we find them in London, four days later, negotiating for the sale of their child. They received £500, the first instalment of her whole purchase-money, £2000, an enormous sum for the time. By the following letter, still extant, Jane acknowledges the Lord-Admiral Seymour, as her guardian :

"To the Right Honorable and my singular good lord, the Lord-Admiral, give these.

"My duty to your lordship, in most humble wise remembered, with no less thanks for the gentle letters which I received from you. Thinking myself so much bound to your lordship for your great goodness towards me from time to time, that I cannot by any means be able to recompense the least part thereof, I purposed to write a few rude lines unto your lordship, rather as a token to show how much worthier I think your lordship's goodness than to give worthy thanks for the same; and these, my letters, shall be to testify unto you that, like as you have become towards me a loving and kind father, so I shall be always most ready to obey your godly monitions and good instructions, as becometh one upon whom you have heaped so many benefits. And thus, fearing I should trouble your lordship too much, I most humbly take my leave of your good lordship.

"Your humble servant during my life,

"JANE GRAYE."

Indorsed: "My Lady Jane, the 1st of Oct., 1548."

It would have puzzled Jane Grey to explain in what consisted the goodness of Lord Seymour which she lauds so highly; and the "Adonis of the Court" bestowing "godly monitions and good instructions" on his young ward, places that gentleman in rather

¹ State Papers, in Tytler. Hayne's Burleigh Papers.

a new light. The letter was evidently written at the dictation of her parents, who were not oblivious of the fact that Seymour, by the terms of their late contract, still owed them £1500 for the wardship of their daughter.

Lord Seymour came at once to Bradgate for the Lady Jane. He would take no receipt for her purchase-money, saying merrily, "The Lady Jane herself is in pledge for it." "And," says Miss Strickland, "for the vile consideration of a few hundred pounds, the parents of Lady Jane Grey saw their sweet child carried away from them by one of the greatest profligates of a profligate court, after having declared, under their autographs, which exist to this day, that he had no one in his establishment by whom her education was likely to be properly finished."¹

Jane continued with Seymour, residing now at one, now at another, of his magnificent seats. In the winter he brought her to his town residence, Seymour Place, where she came under the influence of the notorious Bucer, from whom she imbibed the Calvinistic views she seems to have retained through life. The fact that Jane was allowed to have any intercourse with this wretched creature, would indicate that Seymour was not very choice as to the persons whom he allowed to approach her. But that such a man was her religious monitor is preposterous. Four times had he stood up at the altar of Hymen; and as he had an extensive domestic establishment to maintain, he tried to live on princes and princely families. He may be considered a patron saint of Mormonism, as his name is signed, with the names of Luther and Melanchthon, to the "Church Dispensation,"² whereby the licentious Philip of Hesse was permitted to confer the name and style of *wife* on two women at the same time. It was the public boast of this clerical miscreant that he had taken oaths and vows to the Most High, and violated them.

It was reported about this time that the lord-admiral meant to marry his ward. "When Thomas Parry³ was conferring with Lord Seymour regarding his marriage with the Princess Elizabeth, he proposed going to see her." Parry "had no commission to say her Grace would welcome him." "It is no matter now," said the widower, "for there has been a talk of late; forsooth, they say now I shall marry the Lady Jane." There was no hope now of marrying her to the young king; but the Protector was as little satisfied that she should marry his brother. He applied to the Marquis and Marchioness of Dorset, demanding that their promise of espousing Jane to his eldest son should be ratified; but this worthy pair had not as yet received the whole of her purchase-money.

¹ Tudor Princesses.

Hayne's State Papers.

² See the whole document in Bossuet's *Variations*.

Speaking of his ward to Parr, Marquis of Northampton, Seymour said: "There will be much ado soon for my Lady Jane, Dorset's daughter; for the Lord Protector and his duchess mean to do all they can to obtain her for their heir, young Hertford. However, they will not succeed, for her father has given her up wholly to me, upon certain covenants between us."

Death frustrated all the ambitious projects which had been so long ripening in the plotting brain of Thomas Seymour. Arrested on "thirty charges," he claimed to be confronted with his accusers. But this act of justice was denied him, and the bill for his attainder passed both Houses, almost without opposition. The warrant for the illegal execution of this unfortunate man was signed by his brother, Edward Seymour, the Lord Protector; by his sister's son, King Edward VI., and by his friend and spiritual adviser, Cranmer. Latimer, who was a party to all the intrigues of Seymour, described his execution as an act of justice, averring that he had led a sensual, dissolute, irreligious life, and that God had clean forsaken him. "He was a covetous man, an horrible, covetous man; he was an ambitious man; I wish there were no more in England; he was a seditious man; I would he had left no more behind him. He died irksomely, dangerously, horribly."¹ One scarcely knows which to reprobate most, the unnatural brother, the cruel nephew, or the false friend, to whom a wicked, and perhaps not unrepentant sinner, appealed for consolation and assistance in his last awful need, and who should, as a friend, and, still more, as a minister of religion, have dropped the veil of charitable silence over the mangled remains of the murdered reprobate who had sought his ministrations.

Sir Thomas Seymour survived the consort whose death seemed to open so wide a field to his ambition about six months. He was beheaded on Tower Hill, March 20th, 1549. Among the charges brought against him were his precipitate marriage with Catharine Parr, his presumptuous courtship of the Lady Elizabeth, and his design to marry the king to Lady Jane Grey. Jane's father, Dorset, and Catharine Parr's brother, were the chief witnesses examined against him on the last-named point. Jane was with him at Seymour Place up to the moment of his arrest.

Jane was once more returned to her parents, who were by no means disposed to give her a hearty welcome, being extremely dissatisfied at the failure of their ambitious schemes. She was now in her fourteenth year. The king continued quite insensible to whatever charms of mind and body she possessed, and there is no evidence that her former *fiancé*, the son of the Protector, renewed

¹ Latimer's Sermon on the Bad Life of Sir Thomas Seymour, a most uncharitable, or rather unchristian, production.

his suit. Her father had already offended that powerful magnate by refusing to have her contract with Hertford ratified, and had recently to undergo several severe examinations before the king's council, as to his motives in selling the wardship of his eldest daughter to the king's uncle.

Whatever learning or accomplishments Jane acquired were probably stored up at this period. I do not see how she could have devoted any regular time to study while at court with Queen Catharine, or while travelling with that lady and her fourth husband from one magnificent estate to another, from Chelsea to Hanworth, from Sudeley Castle to Seymour Place, in the slow and ceremonious mode in which great people moved about in those days.

One John Aylmer had been appointed by her father as domestic tutor to his children. This Aylmer is described by Becon¹ as "a young man, singularly well learned both in the Latin and Greek tongue." Aylmer was an immoral man and a hypocrite;² his friend Roger Ascham bore a similar reputation. No conscientious father or guardian would have allowed such men in their families; still less intrust young girls to their care. Poor Jane was singularly unfortunate in her friends, and in those under whose tutelage she fell. Aylmer was subsequently made a bishop by Elizabeth. He was the friend and companion of Fox, and the corrector of the work of that famous and infamous martyrologist; "upon which account," says a panegyrist of Jane, "we may read with greater confidence (?) Fox's minute and interesting account of her."

Ascham is our sole authority for the following anecdote, which, if true, is less creditable to Jane's filial affection than to her classical tastes. One day, having called at Bradgate, he found that all the family had gone out to amuse themselves in the park, except the Lady Jane, who was reading Plato in the original tongue. When Ascham asked her why she forbore to join in the merry pastimes of her family, she replied that all their sport was but a shadow of the pleasure she found in studying Plato. And, growing more confidential, she replied in answer to a second question: "Good Maister Roger, I will tell you a truth which perchance you will marvel at. One of the greatest benefits that God ever gave me is, that he sent me so sharp and severe parents and so gentle a schoolmaster. For when I am in presence either of father or mother, whether I speak, keep silence, sit, stand, or go; eat, drink, be merry, or sad; be sewing, playing, dancing, or doing anything else, I must do it, as it

¹ Becon was an English Reformer. It is impossible to say how often he changed his creed. The Jesuit Waterworth styles him the "Prince of Scurrility."—*Origin and Development of Anglicanism*. I quote the Reformers wherever they refer to Jane or her connections, but cannot vouch for the accuracy of their statements.

² Hatton's Letter-Bag; Archbishops of Canterbury.

were, in such weight, measure, and number, even so perfectly as God made the world, or else I am so sharply taunted, so cruelly threatened—yea, presently, sometimes with *pinches, nips, and bobs*, and other ways, which I will not name for the honor I bear them—so without measure misordered, that I think myself in hell, till the time comes when I must go to Maister Elmer, who teacheth me so gently, and with such fair allurements to learning, that I think all the time nothing while I am with him. And when I am called from him, I fall on weeping, because whatsoever else I do but learning, is full of great trouble, fear, and whole misliking, unto me. And thus my book hath been so much my pleasure, and bringeth daily to me more pleasure and more, that, in respect of it, all other pleasures, in very deed, be but trifles and troubles unto me."¹

Jane and "Maister Roger" must have been alone when this conference took place; she would not have dared to speak in so disrespectful a manner of her parents had she been attended as her rank required. One can hardly believe that a girl of fourteen would be allowed to confer alone with a man of Ascham's character or position. The young lady could use very strong language, too, although there is no evidence that swearing was among the accomplishments of her girlhood, as was the case with her sometime companion, the Lady Elizabeth.

It is well known that the Reformation was forced on England by foreign soldiers and foreign theologians. The latter class found a liberal patron in Jane's father. His house was their home. No matter how despicable these exiles were, morally and spiritually, the Marquis of Dorset allowed them to mingle freely with his wife and daughter. The material aid he bestowed on them, they repaid by the most fulsome flattery of himself and his family. In the letters of these men we trace some particulars of Jane. She added music to her more abstruse studies, and is blamed by them for devoting too much time to it. Her passion for dress seems to have given them much anxiety. Fond as Aylmer is said to have been of his pupil, and cordially as she is supposed to have reciprocated his affection, he was afraid to correct her on either point, which argues badly for the sweetness of her temper. He writes to Bullinger desiring *him* to admonish his pupil as to "what embellishment and adornment are becoming in a young woman professing

¹ *The Schoolmaster.* Ascham is said to have written this book at the request of Sir Richard Sackville, as an argument against cruelty towards scholars. His friend Aylmer was Bishop of London at the time. Whether Jane spoke so freely to Ascham of her parents, or whether Ascham spoke in this way *for her*, and for a purpose, must remain undecided. It is just possible that Ascham may have found Jane in *punishment*, and that her solitude on this occasion was not through love of Plato, but to expiate some of those faults for which her parents were accustomed to give her *pinches, nips, and bobs*, as she elegantly expresses herself.

godliness. Moreover," he adds, "I wish you would prescribe to her the length of time she may properly devote to music, for in this respect the people of England err beyond measure, while all their exertions are made for the sake of ostentation." This *Zurich Letter* was not intended for the eyes of the Dorset family, and it cannot be considered at all complimentary to Jane.

The wonderful letters ascribed to this demi-royal lady I pass over; because if they be genuine, of which there is considerable doubt, it would be impossible to separate the productions of the pupil from the corrections of the master. Sir Harris Nicholas, who has investigated the matter most thoroughly, assures us that there is no ground whatever for most of the marvellous stories which have been narrated of Lady Jane. He doubts, and with reason, her extensive knowledge of Greek. A young lady who devoted so much time to dress, and to the study of music "for ostentation," could not spare much leisure for the classics.

The deaths of Jane's two uncles on the same day, of the plague, raised her father and mother to the rank of Duke and Duchess of Suffolk. A severe illness of the new duchess called Lady Jane to her sick-chamber at Richmond; but though apparently sick unto death, she recovered. One longs to know whether Jane roamed through the spacious apartments of this newly-acquired monastic property. If so she must have met a sight appalling to any one who possessed the slightest nobility of soul. When her father became owner of this supposed monastery he found, probably in one of the side chapels, the embalmed and unburied body of poor James IV. of Scotland, killed at Flodden Field. Instead of giving decent burial to the remains of this brave and unfortunate monarch, who was moreover his wife's uncle by marriage, the newly-made duke permitted the body to be thrown into an old lumber-room, among timber, lead, and other rubbish; in which state Stowe saw it, as he informs us in his *Survey of London*. Jane was old enough to feel rightly about the indignity put upon the fallen warrior. If she expressed her feelings it would probably have availed nothing, for her parents were thoroughly base and unprincipled.

From Jane's childhood, she had much intercourse with her royal cousin, the Princess Mary. Mary was exceedingly kind to the younger branches of the royal family. In her accounts are several entries of presents to "my cousin Jane," who paid many visits to her formidable kinswoman during the latter years of her life. Sometimes when the whole family of the Greys, consisting of father, mother, and three daughters, visited the princess, the Lady Jane remained with her after the departure of the rest. At the Christmas of 1551, festivities were kept up in Jane's family for nearly a month, during which the Greys hired players for the entertainment

of their guests. Jane made all these "progresses" on horseback; and they must have left her scant leisure for Plato. In the spring of 1552, she suffered from severe illness.

On her recovery she began anew her correspondence with the Swiss Reformers, and sent a present of gloves and a ring to the lady who was styled by courtesy Madame Bullinger. In the summer of 1552 Jane visited her royal kinsman, Edward VI., but, though he received her kindly, he was as blind to her charms as ever. Later on she paid a visit to her cousin, the Princess Mary, who presented her with a rich dress. "What shall I do with it?" asked Jane of the lady who brought it. "Marry," replied the messenger, "wear it, to be sure." "Nay," returned the little hypocrite, "that would be a shame to follow the Lady Mary who leaveth God's word, and leave my Lady Elizabeth who followeth God's word."¹ Jane knew perfectly well what the Lady Elizabeth was; and the Princess Mary was, perhaps, the only woman of principle and uprightness with whom she was acquainted. But Mary was suffering grievous persecution for her faith at this period, and Jane, mean little creature that she was, found it perfectly safe to strike one who was already under a cloud.

Another incident gives one a still worse impression of the character of Jane. While she was on a visit to the Princess Mary, Lady Wharton, a Catholic, in passing before the chapel door, paused to make a genuflection before the Blessed Sacrament. Lady Jane, who knew very well why her Catholic companion bowed, asked "if the princess were in the chapel," and on receiving a negative reply, said, "Why, then, do you courtesy?" "I courtesy to Him that made me," was the natural reply of Lady Wharton. "Nay," retorted Lady Jane, "but did not the baker make Him?"

One of Jane's panegyrists—she has had no biographers—calls this a "lively sally." The wit of this "sally" is within the compass of the intellect of an ordinary child of six; the blasphemy is revolting, and argues an irreligious mind. The impoliteness of insulting Mary's religion in her own house is a poor proof of Jane's "extreme amiability."² If Jane, in her numerous visits to her connections, could deport herself in no better style than this, it is no longer surprising that, in her hour of need, she found herself friendless. She must have had a peculiar talent for making enemies.

These anecdotes are recorded to Jane's credit; but to appreciate rightly the audacity of that young woman, insulting in a most uncalled-for manner a royal kinswoman, double her age, and her hostess, we must not view the hapless Mary Tudor by the lurid glare of the Smithfield fires. At this period Mary was known only

¹ Aylmer.

² Burke's Men and Women of the Reformation, vol. ii.

for her virtues. Amid the most extraordinary and heart-rending trials and temptations that ever beset a royal maiden, she had led a life of unwavering integrity, almost every day of which was marked by acts of kindness and beneficence. It is said that Mary, having heard these "precious anecdotes," never after loved her cousin Jane as before. Very likely; how could she love or respect a young woman who repaid her princely hospitality with gratuitous insults to the faith for which she had suffered, and was still suffering, bitter persecutions, and for which she would have deemed it an honor to shed her blood?¹

The miserable reign of Edward VI. was now drawing to a close. Edward Seymour had followed his brother to the block, the first and last victim of an iniquitous law which he himself had made. Jane's father joined the dominant party, now headed by the clever, crafty, and unscrupulous Dudley, who like his predecessor helped himself to a dukedom, and is historically known as Northumberland. Jane's family removed to the neighborhood of the court. They lived partly at Sheen and partly at Gray's Inn, the former being contiguous to Lion House, the favorite country residence of the new duke. As the Seymours were in disgrace since the violent death of the Protector, it is not probable that young Hertford renewed his proposals for the hand of Jane; neither would her parents have bestowed her on the impoverished heir of a fallen house. She was now in her eighteenth year. It became expedient to dispose of her in marriage, and her parents' choice fell on Guilford Dudley, a youth of nineteen or twenty,² the only unmarried son of Northumberland.

¹ The above story is related by Fox, Strype, and Speed. Aylmer, when he became one of Elizabeth's bishops, relates the former in his "*Harboran for Faithful True Subjects.*" He tells another precious story in the same. Speaking of the visit of Mary of Lorraine, Queen-Regent of Scotland, in November, 1551, during which Jane appeared at court, with her mother, in great splendor of attire, he insinuates that the beauty and rich apparel of the blooming dowager, and her train of Scotch and French ladies, wrought a complete revolution in the already too magnificent appointments of the English belles; and he adds that the Princess Elizabeth was the only lady about the court who was not carried away by this evil example. "So that all the ladies went with their hair fruenced, curled, and double curled, except the Lady Elizabeth, who altered nothing, but kept her old shamefacedness." The truth is, the Queen-Regent having just lost her son, was attired from head to foot in the deepest mourning, as were also her ladies, their very faces muffled in black, according to the lugubrious etiquette of the French court at that period. And Elizabeth, not relishing the contingency that the ladies of the Grey family might take precedence of her on a state occasion, did not come near her brother's court during the stay of his distinguished guest.

² Guilford's elder brother, Robert, is said to have been born at the same day and hour as Queen Elizabeth, which Camden attributes to a mysterious conjunction of their planets. If this be correct, and if it be certain that Guilford was the youngest son of his parents, he could not have been twenty, as Miss Strickland states, when he was married to Jane, May, 1553. He is the founder in Christian countries of the heathen

It is said that Jane positively refused to become the bride of this ill-mannered boy, and consented only when her father and mother beat her into a reluctant compliance. From the few particulars we have of her life, we cannot close our eyes to the fact that she possessed no firmness of character, and could be beaten or scolded into anything. She was not even free to marry young Dudley, being legally contracted to another; and if she had possessed a tithe of the virtue attributed to her, she would have suffered death rather than break her faith to the man to whom she had plighted it, and who actually *was* her husband according to the law of God, insomuch that Queen Mary subsequently treated her marriage with Guilford as a nullity.

On Whitsunday, 1553, Jane Grey became Lady Dudley. At the same time her sister Catharine was married to Lord Herbert, and her sister Mary solemnly betrothed to her kinsman, Lord Grey, of Wilton. Both lords deserted their ladies. These luckless marriages were celebrated with extraordinary pomp, much to the annoyance of the populace, who evidently thought such gorgeous nuptial festivities in very bad taste, it being known that their young king, who was related to almost all the contracting parties, was then in a dying condition. It is said that, ill as he was, he did not forget to order the master of his wardrobe to deliver a wedding present to the young bride, who did not object to it as on a former occasion, though it consisted of apparel far richer than that which the Lady Mary had given her out of her poverty. The dying monarch's gift was an ominous one. Cloth of gold and silver, jewels, rich tissues, all from the forfeited effects of Jane's murdered father-in-law, and her imprisoned mother-in-law, the late Duke, and the Duchess of Somerset. Among the manors and domains granted her was one equally ill-omened, Stanfield Hall, from the church tower of which swayed the blackened corpse of Kett, the Hospital Monk,¹ hung in chains, after being dipped in pitch to preserve it, and clothed in the monastic habit. This frightful memento of the ruin of a religious house, oscillating forever in the wind, must have been a weird spectacle for a youthful bride. We soon find Jane with her mother at Sheen, also a suppressed monastery.

practice of calling people by surnames in preference to Christian names. I believe this custom is confined to English-speaking countries. Yet it was only because Northumberland could not mate his son Guilford with Lady Margaret Clifford that he selected for him a daughter of the aspiring house of Grey; the title to the royal succession being considered better than that of Jane Grey's mother and family, as her (Margaret's) mother, Lady Eleanor Brandon, was not born till after the deaths of the ladies whom Charles Brandon styled his spouses, previous to his lofty, but unlawful, alliance with Mary Tudor, sister of Henry VIII.

¹ The body of the brave monk, William Kett, dangled from the highest tower of his monastic church till the day of Queen Elizabeth's death, March 25th, 1603.

The amiable lady¹ who has written so eloquently of the loveliness of Jane's character in domestic life, has not failed to inform us that she was at continual variance with the members of her own family. The case was not altered when marriage removed the young lady to the midst of a new family. The same authority² informs us, not noticing the inconsistency of her statements, that Jane "had a deep dislike to her husband's father and mother; she dreaded and distrusted the one, and abhorred the other;" feelings which a person eminent for "holiness," or "extreme amiability," certainly would not have entertained. Indeed, we have this under Jane's own hand, in a letter to Queen Mary :

"The Duchess of Northumberland promised me, at my nuptials with her son, that she would be contented if I remained at home with my mother. Soon after, my husband being present, she declared 'that it was publicly said there was no hope of the king's life' (and this was the first time I heard of the matter); and further observed to her husband, 'that I ought not to leave her house,' adding, 'that when it pleased God to call King Edward to His mercy, I ought to hold myself in readiness, as I might be required to go to the Tower, since His Majesty had made me his heir.' These words, told me offhand and without preparation, agitated my soul and for a time seemed to stupefy me. Yet they afterwards seemed to me exaggerated, and to mean little but boasting, and by no means of consequence sufficient to keep me from going to my mother." Jane evidently resisted the entreaties of her mother-in-law, for she proceeds : "The duchess was enraged against me, and said that 'it was my duty, at all events, to remain near my husband, from whom I should *not* go.' Not venturing to disobey her, I remained at her house four or five days;" a great concession, considering that these domestic altercations took place during the honeymoon. She carried out her own will as to leaving her mother-in-law, for we find her in Chelsea a little later, and dangerously ill.

Meanwhile the king, whose death was hourly expected, expired on the 6th of July, the anniversary of the judicial murder of the greatest layman of the age, Sir Thomas More. The royal boy, at the dictation of the plotters by whom he was surrounded, left the crown to Lady Jane Dudley, entirely passing over her mother, Frances Brandon, through whom Jane derived her royal descent from Henry VII. and Elizabeth, heiress of the brilliant house of York. Why the Lady Frances was thus set aside in favor of her daughter, no historian has adequately explained. The death of the king was concealed for four days, and on the 10th of July, Jane, having come by water to the Tower, was there publicly received

¹ Miss Strickland.

² *Ibid.*

as queen. At Lion House she had already received the homage of her parents, of the father and mother of her husband, and of several members of the council. Ridley, the usurping Bishop of London, harangued the populace at St. Paul's Cross on the illegitimacy of the sisters of the deceased king, and the blessings likely to result to the country from the prospective reign of Jane Dudley. But his bold and eloquent words evoked no enthusiastic response in the multitude. Their hearts were with the persecuted heiress of the crown, not with the triumphant Grey and Dudley factions.

Meanwhile, Mary Tudor, whose life had been heretofore so retiring, so gentle, so benevolent, now that she had a right to maintain, showed the lion-like spirit of her sturdy race. Her proceedings in this most critical conjuncture evince extraordinary courage and prudence. She fled towards Cambridgeshire with her retinue, and was sheltered by the hospitable Huddlestones during the first night of her perilous queenship. Her enemies were on her track. Early next morning, but not before she had assisted at Mass, Mary journeyed towards her house at Kenninghall, some say in the disguise of a market woman. On turning her steed to cast a last look on the hospitable roof that had sheltered her, the venerable pile burst into flames in her sight. Her enemies thought the fugitive heiress was within the walls. "Let it blaze away," said Mary, "I will build Huddleston, a better house." The present stately mansion, Saws-ton Hall, built at her expense, remains to prove how magnificently Queen Mary kept her promise, and how grateful she was to the friends of her adversity.

The measures taken by the new sovereign from this time until she displayed her royal standard from the towers of Framlingham Castle, are matters of general history. "Had Elizabeth been the heroine of this enterprise instead of Mary," says Miss Strickland, "it would have been lauded to the skies as one of the grandest efforts of female courage and ability the world had ever known. And so it was," the same lady generously adds, "whether it be praised or not."

All authorities, or nearly all, assert that Jane received the news of her elevation with anything but exultation. In the letter which she wrote to excuse her conduct to Queen Mary, she asserts the same, though she admits that she at once (having recovered from her very natural surprise), accepted the position, saying: "If to succeed be indeed my duty and my right, God will aid me to govern the realm to His glory." Jane threw all the blame on her mother-in-law, which was rather ungenerous, as that lady's husband had just had his head cut off at the time Jane wrote. Sharon Turner will not acquit her of all blame. "Jane Grey had descended," says he, "from her social probity to take a royalty which was another's

inheritance, and although opportunity had extorted her acquiescence, yet her first reluctance gave testimony even to herself, that she had not erred in ignorance of what was right; and no one but herself could know how much the temptation of the offered splendor had operated beyond the solicitation, to seduce her to accept what she ought to have continued to refuse."¹

When it is remembered that Jane was educated to become a queen-consort, that she knew that by the will of Henry VIII., only Mary and Elizabeth, last surviving members of a short-lived family,² stood between her and the crown, it is very difficult to believe in the ignorance of the laws which she pleads when she endeavors to shirk responsibility of her doings as "Nine Days' Queen," on the shoulders of her aiders and abettors. I cannot see that Jane, judged by her actions, ever rises above the commonplace, though she sometimes falls below it. I say nothing here of her personal ingratitude towards Queen Mary. An honorable woman would lay her head on the block, rather than be guilty of that execrable vice.

The public occurrences of the *nine days*, are recorded in general history; the private life of Queen Jane was disturbed by the extravagance of her husband, who insisted on being crowned king. Jane soothed him by promising to make him king by act of Parliament, which it appears she had no notion of doing. She told two of her council next day, that she was willing to make her husband a duke, but not a king. Guilford however swore he would be no duke, but King of England. He was actually called *King Guilford* by his own faction, and in several foreign dispatches. It appears by her letter already referred to, that King Guilford "struck her, and swore at her on several occasions;" also that she was "*maltreated*" by his mother. This unfortunate young woman seems to have been utterly incapable of winning the respect or affection of those about her. Not one of her cabinet remained loyal to her, while her much maligned rival was followed by many thousands who served her cause at their own expense. To add to her difficulties, the King Guilford business was making her ridiculous. Part of her brief queenship was spent upon a sick-bed, poisoned, as she charitably suggests, by her unbeloved mother-in-law. In common justice it must be remembered, that the Dudleys and others about whom Jane speaks and writes with such unchristian bitterness,³ have never had any opportunity of repeating *their* version of the story.

¹ History of Edward and Mary.

² All the Tudors, except Elizabeth, died in their prime.

³ In the succeeding reign, the enemies of Jane's brother-in-law, Robert Dudley, the most favored among the paramours of Elizabeth the Unclean, used to say that "he was son of a duke, brother of a *king* (Guilford), grandson of an esquire who was put to

The following is the cautious and accurate Lingard's estimate of the Epiphany Queen:

"Jane has been described to us as a young woman of gentle manners, and superior talents, addicted to the study of the Scriptures and the classics, but fonder of dress than suited the austere notions of the Reformed preachers. . . . Modern writers have attributed to her much, of which she seems to be ignorant herself. The beautiful language which they put into her mouth, her forcible reasoning in favor of the claim of Mary, her philosophic contempt for the splendors of royalty, her refusal to accept a crown which was not her right, and her reluctant submission to the commands of her parents, must be considered as the fictions of historians, who, in their zeal to exalt the character of their heroine, seem to have forgotten that she was only sixteen years of age."¹

We could wish to make this article exhaustive, but the space at our disposal forbids, and we must pass over the better known incidents of the "nine days." What need to give in full the lengthy proclamation in which "Jane, by the grace of God, Queen," sets forth her titles and her claims? Was she not rather like her ancestress, Eleanor of Aquitaine, "queen by the wrath of God?" Mary put down the rebellion almost without a blow. Her illustrious grandmother, Isabella the Catholic, could not have adopted a more prompt, vigorous, and merciful policy. For her future disquiet, she forgave almost every one concerned in the late plot to effect her ruin. Even Jane's father, who had borne arms against her, Jane's mother, who had held up the train of her usurping daughter, Jane's Lord Chancellor, Goodrich,² who had sent her an insolent message during his brief tenure of office under Jane, all were pardoned. True, "Guilford Dudley and his wife" were tried, and pleaded guilty in the historic Guildhall, but it was understood that Jane would never have to pay the penalty of her treasons.

Charles V. advised his cousin to allow the law to take its course, but Mary replied, "that she could not find it in her heart to put her unfortunate cousin to death." The Queen whose clemency was so ill-requited added, that Jane had been but a puppet in the hands of Northumberland, and, knowing well that Jane had been compelled to marry a man with whom she never could be happy,

death as an extortioner, great grandson of a carpenter; the carpenter was the only honest man in the family, and the only one who died in his bed." Despite her many promises of marriage to Leicester, it was said, and it proved true, that Elizabeth would never marry so mean a peer as Robin Dudley, noble only in two descents, and both of them stained with the block. This Dudley lived to have several wives, two of them simultaneously, whom he facetiously styled his Old and New Testaments. Guilford Dudley's family was infinitely beneath the family of Jane Grey.

¹ Lingard's *History of England*, vol. vi.

² *Lives of English Chancellors*, Campbell, vol. ii.

took the earliest opportunity of asserting that she could not legally be Dudley's¹ wife, as she had been validly contracted to another. In fact, it was not possible that Mary could do more in favor of her rival than she did. Jane's prison was a palace; she was allowed to recreate in the queen's gardens; and even on Tower Hill her friends might have free access to her. The Harleian chronicler records that he dined in her company, in the rooms of the lieutenant, on which occasion she remarked, with good reason: "The queen's majesty is a merciful princess." Her remarks on her father-in-law were not so edifying. His head had fallen from the scaffold a week previously, "but," says Miss Strickland, "she had not yet forgiven him."

Jane's father, with his brothers, Lords Thomas and John Grey, were soon again in arms against the sovereign who had so recently pardoned them. Suffolk attempted to purchase his own pardon by betraying his friends and even his own brother. But he had put it out of the queen's power to pardon him now, and his daughter, who had been a sort of hostage for his loyalty, shared his ruin. Mary's councillors declared that revolt and insurrection would never cease while her rival lived, and Mary was persuaded to sign the death-warrant of "Guilford Dudley and his wife."

Feckenham procured a respite of three days. Guilford desired to see his wife, a wife who was to cost that aspiring youth his head; the queen consented, but Jane declined. I would like her better if she had gratified his last expressed wish, for it may be that he wanted to ask her pardon for "the blows and curses" with which he had afflicted her during the eight or nine weeks of their married life, previous to their imprisonment. But even misfortune awakened neither affection nor sympathy in this ill-matched pair, at least not in Jane.

Feckenham, "the amiable abbot,"² whose charity to the poor "allured the minds of his adversaries to benevolence,"³ came to the Tower to console the last days of this unhappy woman. She accepted his ministrations, thanked him for his kindness and hu-

¹ Guilford Dudley, with his brothers, John, Ambrose, Robert, and Henry, was confined in the Beauchamp Tower, a military structure of the 12th century. They were allowed to take exercise on the leads, and, except in case of Guilford, their wives had access to them. Robert's wife was the celebrated Amy Robsart, whom Scott has immortalized in Kenilworth. In the prison-room occurs twice the name JANE, written, perhaps, by one of the Dudleys who suffered so much in her cause. It is said to be the only memorial of Lady Jane preserved in the Tower. As, however, Jane was not beloved by her husband or his family, it is just possible that the name JANE was inscribed by Guilford, in memory of his mother, whose name was Jane, and who passionately loved her tall, handsome, youngest son. The monument of this lady is still to be seen in Chelsea Church.

² Froude.

³ Camden. Feckenham died in prison for his faith, in the reign of Elizabeth.

manity, and even embraced the venerable divine¹ on the scaffold, but I deem it impossible to say in what phase of Protestantism she died. She had been made a widow about an hour before her death. Crucifix in hand, Feckenham stood by her side to the last. Jane wore a black cloth and velvet costume of great elegance. She addressed a few words to the spectators, saying that she most justly deserved the punishment she was about to receive, for allowing herself, although unwilling, to be the instrument of the ambition of others. She confessed that "when she knew the word of God she neglected it, and loved herself and the world," and thanked Him that He had given her a respite to repent. Having asked the prayers of the people, she suffered her two maids to remove her outer robe, while she herself tied a "fair handkerchief" before her eyes and besought the executioner to dispatch her quickly. She had just repeated the psalm, *Have mercy on me, O God, according to thy great mercy.* She now felt for the block, saying, "Where is it? What shall I do?" and, being guided to the spot, knelt down and cried out: "Lord! into Thy hands I commend my spirit." She laid her head on the block, but the five minutes allowed for "royal mercy"—a period of horrible suspense—elapsed before the powerful headsman did the deed of blood. At one blow her head was severed from her body, about noon, February 12th, 1554. Guilford, whom she had married eight or nine months previously, was beheaded on Tower Hill; Jane, on account of her royal descent, suffered on the green² within the Tower. Both were buried in the church close by, between the mangled forms of Anne Boleyn and Catharine Howard.

Thus perished, at the age of eighteen, the unfortunate Lady Jane Grey, "through her own want of firmness in the first instance,"³ and in the second place, as Stowe justly says, "for fear of further troubles and stir for her title." No human person can read her sad story without sympathy and regret. It is hard to think, even after three centuries, of the fair head of a girl of eighteen years rolling from the scaffold. I think Queen Mary regretted the political necessity more than the parents and sisters of the victim; though that princess was not one to feel *repentant* for doing what she deemed to be her duty. The weird stories of the bleeding form of Jane haunting the royal pillow of her successful rival have their source in some lively imagination. Mary was sorry for

¹ Bishop Godwin.

² The precise spot, nearly opposite the door of St. Peter's Chapel, is indicated by a large oval of dark flints. Here, too, Anne Boleyn and Catharine Howard had been murdered. The instrument used at Jane's execution is shown. See Bayley's History of the Tower of London.

³ Flanagan's History of the Church of England, vol. ii.

her luckless cousin, but I doubt if she ever felt the least remorse of conscience for allowing the sentence of Judge Morgan, on "Guilford Dudley and his wife," to take effect. Nevertheless, I am heartily sorry that Mary did not, at all risks, continue to exercise in their regard the royal prerogative of mercy. Still, their early death has been the best friend to their fame.

In personal appearance Jane was not grand or noble. Her features were very small, her forehead so high as almost to amount to a deformity, but the expression sweet and pleasing. In height she was little more than a dwarf, and was therefore accustomed to wear gilt *chopines*¹ (cork soles), which elevated her about four inches. Her dress was of the richest, and her portraits show her rather vulgarly overladen with finery. That in the Earl of Stamford's collection is by far the most pleasing. Tytler admits that "Plato left his pupil leisure for the toilette." All her portraits represent her older than she was; but much unhappiness checkered her young life, and pangs of the heart, no less than years, leave their impress on the countenance.

Poor Jane Grey, the Epiphany Queen, the Nine Days' Wonder, how little have they studied your sad story, who paint you as a paragon of human learning and divine perfection! No one regrets your tragic fate more than I, but truth is dearer to me than the sweetness of an historical memory.

But Jane's mother, was ever woman so tried? Her daughter, her son-in-law, her husband, his brother—all fell beneath the axe within a few days of each other. Could anything console her under such bereavements? Must not the life current have frozen in her veins, and her heart turned to stone, at these horrors? What wonder if, like Rachel, she refuses to be comforted; like Niobe, weeps herself into a statue?

Alas, alas, Jane's father was scarcely cold when her mother, emulating the cruel Henry VIII., who plucked "his Mayflower," Jane Seymour, before the blood of Anne Boleyn was dry on the scaffold, married her groom, Adrian Stokes, a youth of twenty. "Some call the Reformation a tragedy," says Erasmus, "but I call it a comedy, because every new scene ends in a marriage." Was this marriage, certainly the most revolting marriage in history, a tragedy or a comedy? The beheaded Duke of Suffolk had been Frances Brandon's husband from her sixteenth year. He was beheaded February 24th; his brother, Lord Thomas Grey, March 8th, 1554. On the 20th of November, 1554, the mother of Jane Grey gave another heir to the crown, whose father was a groom, and who bore the plebeian name of Stokes! Her sisters, Lady

¹ *Disraeli's Curiosities of Literature.*

Catharine and Lady Mary, were completely neglected by their mother, who was absorbed in her young spouse; but Queen Mary had pity on these desolate girls, took them into her service as maids of honor, and lavished on them the affection denied them by their worthless mother, as they bore honorable testimony when they were being persecuted to death by their cousin, Queen Elizabeth.¹

WHO IS TO BLAME FOR THE LITTLE BIG HORN DISASTER?

1. *Relations des Jésuites* contenant ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable dans les Missions des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus dans la *Nouvelle France*. Three Volumes. Quebec: Augustin Coté. 1858.
2. *Mémoire sur les Mœurs, Coutumes et Religion des Sauvages de l'Amérique Septentrionale* par *Nicolas Perrot*. Publié pour la première fois par le *R. P. J. Tailhan*, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Leipzig et Paris. Librairie A. Franck. 1864.

THE defeat of Custer's command by the Dacotas has taken the country by surprise. To not a few of us the news of the Little Big Horn disaster came like a clap of thunder from a cloudless sky. Nor has the press failed to comment on it in a variety of ways. The full significance of the fact, however, especially from a Catholic point of view, seems not quite generally understood, nor candidly acknowledged. The fall of a gallant officer, rendered more tragical by the simultaneous death of his nearest of kin; the slaughter of four or five companies of soldiers, and the tears and distress of so many bereft parents, widows, and orphans, call for our sincere sympathy. Nor should we forget to feel compassion for the mourners in the Indian camp. Still, if you sum up the sud-

¹ Lady Catharine Grey married her sister Jane's betrothed husband, Lord Hertford; Lady Mary, a dwarf and deformed, married the largest man in London, Sergeant-major Keyes. For these "offences" both ladies were imprisoned, and died state prisoners. They were, besides, entirely destitute, their mother having bestowed all the property in her gift upon Adrian, the groom. Like so many families enriched by Church plunder, the wealth of the Greys did not reach a second generation. Henry Grey, Jane's father, was so notorious for his plunder of churches and monasteries as to draw upon himself the animadversions of a man fully as infamous as himself, Thomas Cranmer,^a who besought him to cease his robberies and sacrileges. Even the "gentle Jane," on her marriage, was dowered with church plunder.

den or violent deaths occasioned all over the country, by the ordinary causes of disease, excessive heat, crime, shipwreck, railroad accidents, and other casualties, you will not find a day in the year that does not add its hundreds of untimely graves and desolate homes to those of the preceding day. Hence a passing expression of sorrow is generally all we can spare for such cases as do not personally concern us; and in the midst of individual cares, and joys, and sorrows, the most heartrending calamities are soon forgotten. So doubtless it will be even with the slaughter of last June.

But it is, or ought to be, quite different with the moral significance of the disaster. This we shall do well not to dismiss so speedily from our thoughts. Is there not something unmistakably providential in the circumstance, that in the very height of her centennial exultation our young and queenly nation has been compelled to endure a public humiliation, the like of which we can scarcely find in the earlier pages of her history? It is a standing disgrace to us, that a nation of forty millions of civilized and, to a great extent, Christian people, is utterly unable to deal in any creditable manner with a few thousands of so-called savages within easy reach? The present Dacota war and our recent defeat have placed this in a very strong light. What is our material progress? What, for example, are the wonders of our Corliss engine and the display of mechanical skill that, at this moment, dazzle the eyes of our guests from every clime, if they see our civilization evidently lacking the power to assimilate by moral influence the last small remnant of barbarian life within the limits of the republic? We boast of the spread of education all over the land. We Catholics glory especially in the number and grandeur of the edifices we erect for the worship of the Father of all men, whether white, black, or red; but in the actual warfare against Paganism and its concomitant evils the gun and the sabre remain our most effective weapons and our last resort. What a few dozens of poor monks or religious achieved in the forests of our own barbarian ancestors, or at a more modern period in the wilds of Paraguay and in the Canadian woods, we, with all the resources of our advanced civilization, apparently are unable to accomplish.

Where lies the fault? "With the savage foe!" a thousand voices exclaim. "Are not the Indians," asks a popular author of England, "beings of an inferior order, incapable of acquiring religious knowledge, or of being trained to the functions of social life?" "The Indian is hewn out of a rock," says a widely-read writer of our own country; "you can rarely change the form without destruction of the substance. . . . He will not learn the arts of civilization, and he and his forest must perish together." Others distinguish. They admit the moral and social perfectibility and openness to religious

influence of some of the tribes, and the possibility of maintaining peaceable relations with them. But, as for the wild hunter tribes of the prairies, they doubt or deny the possibility of ever reclaiming them, and predict their destruction by the gradual failure of the buffalo and wild game on which they now mainly subsist, and by unavoidable hostile encounters with our own ever-advancing population. Others, again, blame the government alone, or the party in power, for the necessity of recurring to violent measures, and for every disgraceful fact connected with our dealing with the red men that is brought to light. In order that the public may arrive at a conclusion, at a correct and just conclusion, and one that is practically serviceable for the solution of the Indian question, information is needed much more full and correct than can be gleaned from the statements, frequently one-sided, and often utterly untrue, of the newspapers. Recently the very name of the Sioux, by some wag, we presume, was interpreted as "cut-throats." And since this assertion in connection with the unavoidable "massacre," has gone the round of the press, another exemplification of the Spanish proverb: *Quien á su perro quiere matar, rabia le ha de levantar.* Any addition, then, to our real knowledge of the Dacota Indians—for so we prefer to call the Sioux—will be welcome at this time to the lovers of truth and humanity. We propose to offer in the following pages a glimpse of their earliest known history, or rather a few facts throwing light on their character, such as we have been able to glean from some of the French writers of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth.

The great misfortune of the Dacotas has been that the Jesuits of that period never gained a foothold among them. Not that they were loath to carry the Gospel to them; on the contrary, they often turned their longing eyes towards the almost limitless territory of the Dacotas in the Far West, and a few of them even set foot on it. But it was not granted to them to remain long enough to make converts or to establish a single mission.

The first mention of the Dacotas, under the name of *Nadvesiv*, we find in Father Vimont's report of 1640, in a chapter entitled, "The hope we have of converting many Indians." His knowledge of them, as obtained from the traveller Nicolet, who some years before had visited Green Bay, was necessarily very limited. He describes them, together with the Assiniboins, the Illinois, the Pottawattamies, and Nassawakwato—Ottawas, as neighbors of the Winnebagoes, who then resided on Green Bay. But little as he knew of them, he already reckons them among those souls for whose conversion and salvation Providence had made Catholic France answerable by placing in her hands the "Great River of Canada," the gate and highway to the nations of the West. This

was at a time when the whole European population of "New France" amounted to less than two hundred and fifty souls.¹

In the year following (1641) Fathers Raymbaut and Jogues went to visit the Ojibwas and Pottawattamies at the outlet of Lake Superior. Among the tribes they there heard spoken of, that of the Dacotas, as might be expected, attracted their particular attention. Their report, as containing the first more accurate (though in some respects not entirely correct) information about that tribe, deserves to be here given in full. "They started," writes Father Vimont in the *Relation* of 1642, "from our house of St. Mary's (on Georgian Bay) towards the end of September, and, after seventeen days of navigation on the great lake or fresh-water sea that bathes the country of the Hurons, they landed at the Falls (Sault Ste. Marie). There they found about two thousand souls, and obtained certain intelligence of a great number of other sedentary tribes that had not yet become acquainted with any Europeans and had never heard a word about the true God, among others, of a certain tribe of *Nadoüessis*, situated to the northwest or west of the Falls, eighteen days' journey farther on. The first nine are performed on another great lake which begins above the Falls; for the last nine days you ascend a river that penetrates far into the country. These people cultivate the land after the fashion of our Hurons. They raise corn and tobacco. Their towns are larger than those of the Hurons, and are better fortified on account of the incessant wars they carry on with the Crees, Illinois, and other great tribes that inhabit the same country. Their dialect differs from both the Algonquin and Huron."²

¹ At the end of the year 1641 there were 240 white settlers ("sedentary population") in Canada. See Censuses of Canada, Introduction, page xvi. Ottawa, 1876.

² The above passage contains the first mention, in the *Relations*, of Lake Superior. The ordinary route from that lake to the Dacota country was by way of the St. Louis River, as shown on the Jesuits' map of 1671; but the distance from the Falls to that river is too great for nine days' canoe travel. The way by the Sturgeon, Ontonagon, or even the Montreal River, and from thence by portages to the head waters of the Chippeway, would answer the description somewhat better. It was the last-named river which the Ojibways of Upper Michigan, in the beginning of the present century, ordinarily descended when on the war-path against the Dacotas. Maize had not yet been introduced among the Dacotas in the seventeenth century; but they gathered wild rice, a cereal unknown at that time to the French. The Fathers seem to have mistaken the *manomin* (wild rice) for *mandamin* (corn). The difference between the Dacota tongue and the various dialects of the Algonquin is very striking, much greater, in fact, than that between any two idioms of the Aryan family. As for the character of the Dacota language (we quote from Charlevoix), "I have elsewhere mentioned the pretence set up that these Sioux have a Chinese accent. This has not yet been substantiated, but in mode of life they greatly resemble the Tartars." Shea's Charlevoix, iii, p. 33. To this Mr. Shea adds, in a note, "The affinity of the Dacota and Tartar alluded to in Charlevoix's Journal, pp. 183-4, has been recognized even by modern philologists." To readers interested in the study of comparative philology or ethnology, it will be gratifying to learn that, as far as a mere comparison of words can

In the *Relation* of 1656 the *Nadouesiouek* are said to inhabit forty villages, and the *Pouanak*, or western Dacotas, thirty.¹ Two years later the statement is repeated, with the additional information that the *Poualak* were located west by north, and the *Nadouechioueck* and *Mantoueck*² at ten days' journey northwest of the head of Green Bay. It was intended that they should form part of Father Druillette's contemplated Green Bay Mission of St. Michael's. The first Europeans, however, that went to visit the Dacotas were two young Frenchmen, in 1658, who accompanied the Ottawa fur traders to the south shore of Lake Superior. A tradition is reported to exist among the Dacotas themselves that they murdered the first white man who appeared among them. Whatever the western bands may have done, those in the east gave a most friendly reception to their first white visitors, Des Grosilliers and his companion. These courageous men struck into the woods, apparently from Keweenaw Bay, and, travelling in a southwesterly direction, first met the fugitive Tionontate Hurons, who were then at the source of the Black River. From thence they must have proceeded west, for they spent the winter of 1659-60 with Buffalo's band (*la nation du bœuf*), or the sedentary Dacotas, whose territory lay on both sides of the upper

prove it, there seems to be a still closer relationship between the Dacota dialect and the dialects of the non-Aryan or dark-complexioned inhabitants of India, especially the tribes of Nepaul, whose idioms belong to what Max Müller terms the "Sub-Himalayan branch of the Jangetic class of the southern division of the Turanian family." As there are many other indications that the American Indians, in general, belong to the primitive race whose débris are recognized in the non-Aryan aborigines of India, the subject here alluded to deserves to be more closely examined by those who have the time, the ability, and the literary helps. As a small contribution, we give, in an appendix, a meagre comparative vocabulary.

¹ This statement rests on the testimony of two young Frenchmen, who had just returned from an excursion to Green Bay. The *Nadouesiouek* (properly *Nadowessi*, plural *Nadowessiwag*, which is still the Ottawa name of the Dacota tribe), and *Pouanak* (properly *Bwan*, plural *Bwanag*, the Ojibwa term for the whole tribe), then formed the two great divisions of the nation. The former name was by the early French writers applied to the eastern, or sedentary; the latter to the western, or nomad, Dacotas. This distinction was dropped when a better acquaintance with the tribe disclosed the fact that *Nadowessiwag* and *Bwanag* were but one people; and the term *Sioux*, which is simply the last syllable of *Nadowessi* (or rather *Natowesiw*, as still pronounced by the Crees), was applied to both divisions. The word *Nadowessi* is derived from *Nadewe* (sometimes spelled *Nottoway*), the Algonquin term for Huron-Iroquois, but also applied to a certain species of snakes. Whether the reptile obtained its name from those tribes, or *vice versa*, is now impossible to decide, and so is the question whether *Nadowessi* originally meant a *little* Iroquois or an Iroquois *beast*; there are grounds for either interpretation. The Sioux themselves are said to dislike this name, or sobriquet, and would rather be called by their own well-sounding name, *Dacota*, which means *leagued*, or allied.

² If the *Mantoueck* (properly *Mandwe*, plural *Mandweg*), were Dacotas, as there is every reason to believe, we might recognize in their name an Algonquin corruption of *Mdewakang*. The *Mdewakang-tonwangs* (Village, or People of the Spirit Lake) were the most eastern of the Dacota bands, and originally inhabited those regions, to which the brief remarks in the *Relations* point as the home of the *Mantoueg*.

Mississippi, principally between the St. Croix on the east and the St. Peter's or Minnesota River on the west. According to the most probable statement, that part of the tribe then numbered four thousand warriors, or about twenty thousand souls.¹ What struck those travellers most was the sight of women, frightfully disfigured by having their noses cut off, and the top of their heads scalped. This was the penalty for adultery, and gave the Jesuits a favorable opinion of the comparative strictness of morals in a tribe where polygamy prevailed, as it still does, to a certain extent.²

Des Groseillers's account of the western or nomad Dacotas, as given in the *Relations*, is as follows: "These warlike Indians have made themselves as formidable, with their bows and arrows, among the Upper Algonquins, as the Iroquois are among the Lower. Hence their name, *Poualak*, which means *warriors*.³ As wood is scarce with them, and of small growth, nature has taught them how to make fire with coal,⁴ and to cover their cabins with skins. Some, more industrious, make themselves houses of clay, very much as swallows build their nests; and in these they would sleep no less sweetly than the great ones of the world under their golden panelings, were it not for the fear of the Iroquois, who travel in search of them to a distance of five or six hundred leagues." To this the writer of the *Relations* characteristically adds: "But if the Iroquois go thither, why should not we go likewise? If there are conquests to be made, why shall Faith not make them, as she does elsewhere, all over the world? Behold those numberless people! The road, it is true, is barricaded. We must, therefore, break through every obstacle, and, passing through death in a thousand shapes, we must throw ourselves into the midst of the flames to deliver so many poor nations."

¹ The above statement, as to numbers, is culled from the manuscript journal of the Superior of the Jesuits in Quebec. We prefer it to the very different account in the *Relation* of 1660, according to which five of the forty villages of eastern Dacotas contained 5000 men, the text leaving it doubtful whether this is to be understood disjunctively or collectively. According to Perrot, the sedentary Dacotas, before they were "reduced to nothing" by their wars, numbered at least from six thousand to seven thousand warriors.

² The assertion of the two travellers, that every Dacota brave had at least seven wives, is an evident exaggeration; otherwise the numerical proportion between the sexes would have been strangely abnormal. According to the census of 1847, the number of males between the ages of 18 and 60 years in six Minnesota bands, was 300, that of females 369. At present the females are said to form about 60 per cent. of the whole population.

³ *Bwanag* is now the ordinary pronunciation, the letter l being wanting in the alphabet of most Algonquin dialects. The Crees of Labrador would still pronounce *Bwalag*. We know of no Algonquin root that would justify the travellers' interpretation.

⁴ Probably a misunderstanding! The fuel used by the prairie tribes in summer-time was most likely then, as it is now, *bois de vache* (bison dung). On Bellin's *Carte de la Louisiane*, published in 1744, and reprinted in Shea's *Charlevoix*, vol. vi., there is, however, a coal mine marked in the Dacota country, near the St. Peter's River.

These were not mere words. While they were penned an aged Jesuit was toiling along the frightful road to Lake Huron, and in less than a year he was on his way to the Dacotas. On the 13th of July, 1661, Father Menard, the first missionary on Lake Superior, left Keweenaw Bay for the interior of Upper Michigan. His immediate intention, it is true, was to succor the once half-Christian Tionontate Hurons on the Black River, but his ulterior object was evidently to push through to more western regions, and open a mission among the Dacotas. This is shown by the concluding remarks of his last letter, written only eleven days before his departure. "Every day," he says, "I hear the Indians speak of four numerous tribes,¹ two or three hundred leagues from this. I hope to die on the way; however, having come so far and being full of health, I shall do what is possible to reach them. The road is an almost continual series of marshes, through which you have to sound your way, being in danger of becoming engulfed beyond the possibility of extricating yourself. Means of living there are none, except what you carry with you. The number of mosquitoes is frightful. These are the three great difficulties to my finding a companion. I hope to throw myself among some Indians that intend to undertake the journey. God will dispose of us according to His will and for His greater glory, be it through death or life. It would be a great mercy on his part, were he to call me to Himself in so good a place."

The courageous old missionary's presentiment was soon fulfilled. After a month's travel, and within a day's journey of the Huron village, he lost his way in the woods, and perished, or was killed. Father Menard's death has been charged to the Dacotas, but without sufficient cause, as will be seen from the very account that gave rise to the accusation. Nicolas Perrot thus describes the event: "One day his (Menard's) companion found himself in a rapid that carried off his canoe. The father, in order to lighten it, took out some of his baggage, and, as he went to rejoin his companion, missed the way. He took a path beaten by animals, and whilst trying to return to the right one, became entangled in a labyrinth of trees. His French companion having passed over the rapids with great difficulty, waited for the good father, and when he failed to make his appearance, resolved to go in search of him. For several days he searched the woods and called him at the highest pitch of his voice,

¹ What tribes these were can only be surmised; but from the description of the way to reach them, none other could have been meant than the western neighbors of the Keweenaw Indians, and among them the Dacotas. Besides the two divisions of the Dacotas proper, two other kindred tribes, the Assiniboin (*Assini-Bwanag*, or "Stone-Sioux") and the Iowas (*Aeioweg, Mashkode-Nadowessiwag*, or "Sioux of the Prairies") might have been spoken of.

hoping to discover him, but all in vain. Subsequently he met a Sac Indian, who carried the missionary's kettle, and gave him some information about him. He declared that he had found his tracks far off in the country, but that he had not seen the father himself. He told him that he also had found the tracks of several other persons, going in the direction of the Sioux. He gave it as his opinion that the Sioux had killed him or made him prisoner. In fact, several years later, his breviary and his cassock were found among the Sioux, who displayed them at their banquets, offering up to them their dishes."

Shall we give credit to the Indian's story? Could not he who carried off the father's spoils have also taken his life? On this point the *Relations* of 1667 give the following account: "An Indian found, some time after, the father's provision-bag, but he would not confess that he had found his body, for fear of being accused of having killed him, which perhaps he did; for those savages do not hesitate to kill a man whom they meet in the woods, for the purpose of despoiling him. And, in fact, there were seen in one of their cabins, several articles that had belonged to the father's (portable) chapel." If Father Menard's breviary and cassock were preserved by the Dacotas as objects of religious worship, there are various ways to explain how these articles found their way among them from either the Sacs or the Hurons, for encounters between the Dacotas and those two tribes were frequent. To explain the origin of these hostilities we must retrace our steps for the space of three or four years, and, leaving our customary guides, the *Relations*, turn to the *Mémoire* of Nicolas Perrot.¹

According to Perrot, the Ottawas and Tionontate Hurons, who in their flight from the Iroquois had reached the Mississippi about 1657, were the first Indians provided with European goods that came in contact with the Dacotas. Some of these fugitives, having been found hunting on the grounds of the Dacotas, were captured by them and taken to one of their villages. Had these captives been killed on the spot as trespassers, it would have been in accordance with the custom of many other tribes; but the Dacotas, as all the early writers assure us, were the most humane of all the

¹ Nicolas Perrot came to Canada while quite a youth. Having fulfilled his apprenticeship among the Indians as a servant of the Jesuits, he took a very conspicuous part in many official transactions between the colonial government and the Indians during his whole life, which was a long one, and one half of which was passed among the western Indian tribes. His *Mémoire* was not written until 1717; but, as he was himself an eye-witness to most of the events he relates, or at least obtained his information from those who were eye-witnesses, his account of transactions that took place during the latter half of the preceding century is quite trustworthy. His honesty has never been doubted. Father Tailhan's learned and judicious annotations greatly enhance the value of Perrot's interesting *Mémoire*.

northwestern Indians. Those children of nature, seeing at a glance the vast difference between their own stone knives and flint hatchets and the iron utensils in the hands of the new-comers, received them like beings of another world and honorably conducted them back to their friends. A few presents, such as hatchets, knives, and awls having been given to the Dacotas and distributed by them among their different villages, deputations from each village at once set out for the Ottawa and Huron camp, and in order to express their joy and manifest their high esteem for the strangers, as well as to gain their good will, those grave and powerful men, according to their singular custom, laid their hands on their new friends and with copious tears implored their mercy and begged them to make them also partakers of the mysterious black metal. No more was needed to fill the Ottawas and Hurons with disgust and contempt towards the Dacotas. Who had ever beheld a tear in the eyes of a brave, or sober Indian? They at once rated the Dacotas as cowards unfit for war, and far beneath themselves in every respect. They, however, presented their ambassadors with a few more trinkets, who thereupon lifted up their eyes to heaven in thankfulness that a people had been sent to them able to put an end to their misery. Their wonder and admiration reached its highest point when a few Ottawas who had guns fired them off, proving thereby that they were masters of the thunder, one of the most potent Dacota divinities. Upon this, more signs of humble submission were made, and caresses were lavished on the proud visitors. Poor simple souls! Even then a lesson was given to them which they would have done well to remember in later times and in their dealings with more powerful intruders.

With the permission of their friendly hosts, or without asking for it, the allies made their home on a pleasant island in Lake Pepin, where they were frequently visited by the Dacotas.

In continuing the narrative we shall use the exact words of our honest, though somewhat illiterate, author, and the reader will decide whether the passage does not read like a page of modern history.

"One day it happened that the Hurons, being out hunting, met some Sioux, *whom they killed*. The Sioux, missing their people, had no suspicion of what had become of them. A few days later they found their dead bodies, with their heads cut off. They returned in haste to their village to make known the sad news, and met on the way some Hurons whom they took prisoners. When they arrived at their village the chiefs released them and sent them back to their people. The Hurons, presumptuous enough to imagine that the Sioux were unable to resist them without iron weapons and firearms, conspired with the Ottawas to attack and wage

war against them, in order to chase them out of their country, so as to be able to spread more widely and gain their livelihood more easily. So the Ottawas and Hurons joined and marched against the Sioux. They imagined they would only have to show themselves to put them to flight. But they were greatly mistaken. For the Sioux withstood their assault and repulsed them; and had they not retreated they would have been entirely defeated by the great numbers that came to the rescue from other allied villages. They pursued the Ottawas and Hurons to their establishment, where they were compelled to throw up a miserable fort, which, nevertheless, sufficed to cause the Sioux to retire, as they durst not undertake an assault. The continual raids, however, which the Sioux made upon them finally compelled them to leave the country" (about 1658).

Thus the Dacotas appear invariably throughout the further course of their early history—hospitable, naturally inclined to peace, confiding to a fault, and hence often the dupes of the crafty; but also brave, more so even than most other Indian tribes, and, when outraged beyond farther endurance, able to retaliate, and ready, if needs be, to perish in defence of their rights. The warfare they were engaged in with the Crees and Illinois, and other northern and southern neighbors, was in all probability not of their own seeking. For it was their custom never to give the first offence. When a treaty was concluded between them and any of their enemies, they never were the first to break it. How forbearing they were even in their revenge, and how much less cruel and inhuman than either Huron-Iroquois or Algonquins, will be seen in the sequel. We resume Perrot's narrative, using again, in part, his own words.

The Dacotas seeing their enemies gone, did not molest them any longer; but the Hurons continued from their new fort on Black River to harass the Dacotas by small war-parties. This caused frequent retaliatory attacks on the part of the Dacotas, who finally drove the Hurons from their position in the interior and forced them to join their Ottawa friends in Chegoimegon, on the south shore of Lake Superior, in 1661 or 1662. They had hardly pitched their wigwams when a party of a hundred warriors—apparently the whole force of the tribe—set out for the valley of the St. Croix, the lacustrine home of their enemies. The character of the ground gave a great advantage to the Dacotas. Among a great number—a network, as it were—of small lakes, or wild rice swamps, the population was scattered in hamlets of five or six families, but in such proximity that in case of a sudden attack the first alarm would bring a large number of warriors to the rescue. These lakes were separated by narrow slips of land, some from forty to fifty

paces in width, others no more than five or six. Across these little isthmuses the Dacotas, in pursuing the enemy, carried their light canoes, and thus speedily passed from lake to lake, while the invaders were obliged to make the circuit, and thus, if worsted, had hardly a chance of escape left to them. The Hurons, apparently unaware of all these circumstances, and unprovided with canoes, had penetrated into this marshy region, when the Dacotas discovered their tracks.

"More than three thousand Dacotas arrived from all sides, and invested the Hurons. The din and clamor and the yells that rent the welkin, gave them to understand well enough that they were surrounded on all sides, and that nothing was left to them but to make a firm front against the Sioux, who would not be long in discovering them, unless some favorable opportunity for a retreat presented itself. In this strait they judged that the best thing they could do, was to hide themselves amidst the growth of wild rice, where they stood in mud and water up to the chin. They dispersed, one by one, in all directions, being very careful not to make any noise in walking. The Sioux, who sought them with great care, being eagerly bent on catching them, upon finding but very few, came to the conclusion that the main body of them must be hidden in the wild rice. What astonished them most was, that all the tracks they could discover were of persons coming out and none going in.¹ So they bethought themselves of spreading beaver-nets across those little isthmuses, and attached to them hawk-bells, which they had received from the Ottawas and their allies along with other presents on the occasion already mentioned. They stationed strong detachments to guard all the passages, and watched by night as well as by day, presuming the Hurons would try to escape under cover of darkness the danger that hung over them. And in fact they succeeded. For the Hurons, sneaking out in the night, crept on all-fours, and without a suspicion of the snares laid for them, went head foremost against the nets which they could not escape, and which did not fail to ring. The Sioux in ambush took them prisoners as fast as they presented themselves."

Only one of the party of invaders was lucky enough to escape.² And what was the fate of those that fell into the hands of an enemy so justly indignant? A small number were condemned to death,

¹ If the Dacotas were really astonished at such a well-known Indian stratagem—the Hurons having simply walked backwards into the swamps—it would prove them to have been the most unsophisticated of red-skins. In fact, Perrot declares, further on, that they were less cunning than other Indians.

² His French name was Le Froid, and he was not long dead when Perrot wrote his *Mémoire*. Our author must have frequently seen him in Michilimackinac; nor did he lack opportunities to hear the story related by the Dacotas, among whom also he spent several years.

the rest were detained until they had witnessed their comrades' execution, and then were sent home unhurt. Those selected as a warning example were tied to trees or posts and pierced with arrows. But this was left to the youth; no brave, or adult man or woman, would take part in the execution. The bodies were simply thrown aside and covered up. Such was the custom of the Dacotas, until they learned that when their warriors were captured by their eastern enemies they were cruelly tortured and burned to death. The law of reprisal, or Indian point of honor, then obliged them to act likewise; but, being naturally more compassionate, they ever remained bunglers in the cruel work, and generally, after a few applications of the fire-brands, hastened to put an end to it by braining their victims; nor did they ever feast on their flesh. Such is the testimony of Perrot, who was personally acquainted and on friendly terms with them, as well as with their eastern enemies, and who had no reason for partiality towards either side.

For nearly a decade after their defeat in the wild rice swamps the Hurons of Chegoimegon dared not attack their powerful neighbors; nor did the Dacotas, who had a sufficient number of other enemies on their hands, commit any act of hostility against the Hurons.¹ During this time the Huron and Ottawa mission of

¹ Besides the Crees and Assiniboin in the North and the Illinois in the South, the Dacotas had, since about the middle of the seventeenth century, to contend with the Foxes, Sacs, Maskotens, and Kikapoos, late immigrants into the neighborhood of Lake Winnebago and Green Bay. In consequence of those wars, especially with the three last named tribes, they had, according to Perrot, in the second decade of the eighteenth century, become very much reduced (*ils ne sont à présent qu'en très petit nombre*). If we rightly understand a mutilated, or otherwise obscure passage, on page 91 of his Mémoire, the Dacotas of the prairies had at that period only one hundred warriors, while those on the Mississippi, between the St. Peter's and St. Croix Rivers (*ceux qui vont en canot*) had also fallen very far below their former number, which, in the preceding century, had been "above six or seven thousand men." Hence, if we assume about four thousand to have been the number of their men in the first quarter of the last century—a very liberal allowance, if Perrot's computation is even approximately correct—the Dacotas have, within the last one hundred and fifty years, not decreased, but, like several other northwestern tribes, considerably gained in numbers. They are now variously estimated at from 30,000 to 50,000 souls, or even more, the difference in the computation partly arising from the circumstance that in some of these estimates other kindred tribes are counted with the Dacotas. How little reliable, however, even official estimates are, will appear from the vacillations in the following list:

Year.	Authority.	Number of Souls.
1829, General Porter, Secretary of War,	•	15,000
1834, General Cass, Secretary of War, .	•	27,500
1836, Official estimate,	•	21,600
1836, Statistical returns,	•	23,991
1847, Official estimate,	•	27,663
1850, Official estimate,	•	30,000
1850, Statistical returns,	•	15,560
1855, Statistical returns,	•	27,663

In connection with Indian statistics, an inaccuracy in the last number of the Quar-

Chegoimegon, or La Pointe du St. Esprit, was begun by Father Allouez (1665). As this missionary was the first priest whom the wonder-stricken Dacotas beheld, and who described them from personal experience, we cannot resist the temptation to translate the greater part of a chapter he devotes to them under the heading, "Of the Mission of the Nadouessiouek."

"These are people who dwell to the west from here (he writes from La Pointe), towards the great river, called Messipi. They are forty or fifty leagues off, on prairies abounding in all kinds of game. They have fields in which, however, they do not plant any corn, but only tobacco. Providence has supplied them with a sort of swamp rye (wild rice), which they gather, towards the end of the summer, on small lakes that are covered with it. They know how to prepare it so as to make it very palatable and nourishing. They gave me some of it when I was at the head of Lake Tracy (Superior), where I saw them. They have no guns, but only bows and arrows, in the use of which they are very skilful. Their cabins are not covered with bark, but with stag-skins (buffalo hides?) well dressed, and so nicely sewed that the cold does not penetrate. These Indians are shy and wild above all others. In our presence they appear dumfounded and motionless like statues. They are, nevertheless, martial, and have carried on war with all their neighbors, by whom they are exceedingly dreaded. They speak an entirely strange language; the Indians of this neighborhood do not understand them. Hence I was obliged to address them through the medium of an interpreter who, being an infidel, did not do as well as I should have wished. Nevertheless, I snatched one innocent soul of that country from Satan. This was a little child that went to heaven soon after I had baptized it. *A solis ortu usque ad occasum laudabile nomen Domini.* God will open an opportunity to announce among them His word and glorify His holy name, whenever His divine majesty shall deign to show mercy to that people."

Neither Allouez nor his successor at Chegoimegon, Father Marquette, were able to bestow upon their Dacota neighbors more than the humble supplications they offered up in their behalf before the throne of grace. Some insight into the plans of Marquette and his fellow-missionaries, at that period, may be gained from the concluding passage in this Father's report of 1670. After a short notice of the Dacotas, in which he too bears testimony to their inviolable fidelity in keeping their word, he continues: "I have sent

terly may here be corrected. Lines fourth to eighth, on page 406, ought to read as follows: The present numerical strength of one of the last-mentioned Algonquin tribes, the Ottawas, is not inferior to, and that of the two others, Menomonees and Ojibwas, is even greatly in excess of, what it was at the time of the Jesuits' first arrival among their fathers.

them a present by an interpreter, telling them that they must recognize the Frenchman wherever they meet him ; that they must not kill either him or the Indians that accompany him ; that the black gown is about to pass to the Assiniboins and Crees ; that he is already with the Outagamis (Foxes), and that I am going, this autumn, to the Illinois, to whom they should leave me a free passage. They agreed to this ; but as for my present, they wished to wait until all their people would return from the chase, stating that they were to come to La Pointe in the autumn, in order to hold counsel with the Illinois, and to speak with me. Would that all these nations loved God as much as they stand in awe of the French ! Christianity then would soon flourish !'

All these far-reaching plans were doomed to failure. About the time Father Marquette wrote his report, or soon after, an event took place which led to the renewal of hostilities, and changed the whole face of affairs. It was again the Hurons' perfidy that caused the breach of peace.

About three years before the event in question a party of Hurons, having, on a hunting excursion to the neighborhood of the Dacotas, met a few of that tribe, took them prisoners and carried them off to Chegoimegon. There existed, even then, a strong inclination on the part of the Hurons to "put them into the kettle ;" but the remonstrances of the Ottawas prevailed, and one of their chiefs with his braves and four Frenchmen, conducted them back to their people. Overlooking all that had passed, the Dacotas not only gave those Ottawas a most friendly reception, caressing them in their customary manner, but even adopted the leader of the party into their own tribe, and constituted him one of their chiefs by performing in his honor the solemn dance of the calumet.¹ The cere-

¹ A short description of the ceremony called by our author *the singing of the calumet to, or with, a person*, is found in *La Potherie*, II., 185. At the performance there described, Nicolas Perrot himself was the recipient of that distinguished honor on the part of the Iowas, a tribe of the Dacota stock. The following is a translation :

"Forty *Ayoës* came to trade at the French fort (on the Upper Mississippi). Perrot returned with them to their village, where he was very well received. The chief begged of him to deign accept the calumet which they wished to sing to him ; he consented. This is an honor accorded only to such as, in their estimation, hold the rank of great captains. He sat on a fine buffalo robe ; three *Ayoës* held his body from behind, while the others sang, holding calumets in their hands and making them keep time with their singing. The one who rocked his body made him also move according to time, and thus they spent a good part of the night singing the calumet."

The great importance of this ceremony is quite rhapsodically described by Perrot himself : "They constitute him who has thus been honored a child of the nation, or naturalize him. People are bound to obey him after the calumet has been presented and sang to him. The calumet obliges and engages those who have sang it to follow to war the stranger in whose honor it has been sung, without placing himself under the same obligation. The calumet arrests in their course the warriors of the tribe of those who have sung it, and puts an end to every sort of vengeance which one might be en-

mony took place in several villages in the presence of all the chiefs, who solemnly pledged themselves to an inviolable peace.

“After the solemnity”—we translate again from Perrot, with a few slight verbal changes—“the Sinago (Ottawa) chief returned with his people and his French companions to Chegoimegon, having promised the Sioux to visit them again in the following year. This he failed to do; nor did he return in the second year. The Sioux were at a loss to think what could make him tarry. It happened, however, that some Hurons, having gone a hunting in the neighborhood of the Sioux, were taken prisoners by some young men of the tribe and carried to their village (1670). The chief who had sung the calumet to the head man of the Sinagos was in high dudgeon at the sight of those prisoners, and at once took it upon himself to protect them. He came near striking those that had captured them, and little was wanting to cause a war between his village and that of the young men who had done the mischief. The chief gained his point and caused the Hurons to be set free. On the very next day he sent one of them back to Chegoimegon with the assurance that he the Sioux chief was not in fault in this affair, but that a few mischievous young men, who did not even belong to his band, had committed the deed, and that in a few days he himself would bring back those he still kept with him.

“Now the Huron whom he had sent to Chegoimegon, whether he lied of his own accord or was put up to it, declared that the Sioux had taken him and his companions prisoners, that he had luckily escaped out of their hands, and that he knew not whether his comrades were still alive, or had been put to death.

“The Sioux chief who had sung the calumet with the chief of the Sinagos was anxious (as already mentioned) to go in person and return the Huron prisoners to their people. He started with them from his village, but as soon as they found themselves in the neighborhood of Chegoimegon, they secretly left him. Having

titled to take for persons killed. The calumet causes the suspension of hostilities; it serves as a pass of admission to deputations of enemies who would go to a tribe, some of whose people were recently killed by them. It is the calumet, in a word, that has the power to confirm anything, and that adds credit to solemn oaths that are taken. The Indians believe that the Sun has given it to the Pawnees, and that since, it has been handed from village to village, as far as the Ottawas. They have so much respect and veneration for it that they look upon him who would violate the calumet as false and treacherous, and call his crime unpardonable. Such was once the firm persuasion (*l'entêtement*) of the Indians. They are still of the same opinion; but this does not prevent some occasional foul dealing in the use of the calumet. Those of the prairies are inviolably attached to it, and hold it as something sacred. They would never go against the faith promised to those who have sung it, even if their tribe had stricken at their own; provided the person himself that sung it had not perfidiously had a hand in the blow. He would be the greatest of traitors, because he would break the calumet and sunder the union established by its means.”—*Mémoire*, p. 99.

arrived at home, they likewise said that they had escaped death by flight. The Sioux chief was greatly surprised when he missed them in the morning; nevertheless, he persisted in his resolution to continue his journey, and the same day he reached the village. But not daring to go to the Hurons, whom he distrusted, he entered the cabin of the Sinago chief to whom he had sung the calumet, who received him very well, and so did all the Ottawas. He made a speech to them, giving them to understand that he had set the Hurons at liberty. The party consisted of five, including a woman who accompanied them. The Hurons, cunning and treacherous above all other Indians, not succeeding in making the Ottawas believe that the captives had obtained their liberty by flight, had recourse to presents in order to gain the Sinago chief, with whom the Sioux were lodged. They succeeded. The bribe took effect, and all the Ottawas, led away by the chief's example, went so far in their inhumanity as to 'put them into the kettle' and eat them. At the same time, abandoning their villages, they went to live in Michillimackinac and Manitoulin.¹

Thus, already two hundred years ago, began the *education* of the simple Dacotas through the means of examples set to them by a superior race; for such, intellectually, the Hurons undoubtedly were. It is difficult not to suspect in such fiendish deeds the direct working of a dark, invisible agent, laying countermines against the approach of an opposite and hated power. However this may be, little did those archtraitors think what a mighty turn they gave to coming events, when, by that foul murder, they occasioned the breaking up of their establishment at Chegoimegon. Had it continued and prospered, and had it, instead of Michillimackinac, become a central point of missionary and commercial intercourse between the French and the northwestern Indians, and had the Jesuits—as under this expectation they were most likely to have done—soon extended the mild sway of their Christian influence over the Dacotas and their neighbor tribes, they would, from that point and among those tribes, as well as among the Ojibwas, the Ottawas, Menomonees, Pottawattamies, and Winnebagoes, have prepared the way for civilization, and thus, in the only manner possible, have solved the Indian question, long before the birth of our republic. By the abandonment of that post the progress of the gospel towards the Northwest was suddenly and permanently arrested, and a legacy left to our own times that seems well-nigh too heavy a burden for our shoulders.

¹ For a short description of the campaign of the united Hurons, Ottawas, Pottawattamies, Sacs, and Foxes, and their rout by the Dakotas, in the following year (1671), the reader is referred to the July number of the Quarterly, pp. 427 and 428. In the same number, line twentieth, of page 420, read *Hurons* instead of *Sinagos*.

The Jesuit fathers, notwithstanding the occurrences above mentioned, did not abandon the hope of finding an entrance among the Dacotas. Those outraged people had, in a manner, shown their appreciation of Father Marquette's overture by respectfully returning, before they struck a blow, the holy images he had offered them as a present. An opportunity to resume friendly relations with the Dacotas was afforded the missionaries by the fortunes of the war itself. For a few years a desultory warfare was carried on, with varying success, by the Ojibwas of Lake Superior, who only from that time begin to occupy a more prominent place in the records of the century. A remarkable advantage gained over the Dacotas by the band at Sault Ste. Marie some time before, or early in the spring of 1674, prompted the mighty tribe to sue for peace. While the negotiations were pending, the Fathers of that mission, happy to have found the long-wished-for opportunity, at once employed themselves in teaching the Dacota ambassadors; and, charmed with their docility, began to conceive great hopes of opening a mission among that tribe. How the envy of the powers of darkness there again disconcerted their plans, Father Dablon relates in the following manner:

"Massacre of ten Nadouessi envoys and twenty other Indians, which took place in the house of St. Mary of the Falls."¹

"The Nadouessi, a tribe extremely numerous and warlike, were the common foes of all the Indians comprised under the name of Ottawas, or Upper Algonquins. They carried their arms even to the remote North, waging war against the Kilistinons (Crees) who dwell there. Everywhere they made themselves formidable by their boldness, by their numbers, and by their skill in battle, where, along with other arms, they make use of stone-knives. Of these they always carry two, one fastened to their belts, the other hanging in their hair. A party of braves from St. Mary of the Falls, having surprised them in their country and taken eighty prisoners,² obliged them to sue for peace. For this purpose they sent ten of their most fearless men to the Falls to negotiate. They were received with joy, as soon as the object of their coming became known. But the Kilistinons who had lately arrived, and others called Missisaquis, not only manifested their dissatisfaction, but also determined to prevent the conclusion of the peace and even to massacre the envoys. Therefore, for safe keeping, the envoys were lodged in the French house (a log cabin) that had been built for the use of the missionaries.

"Father Gabriel Druillettes employed this opportunity to instruct them in our holy faith. They listened with such docility that, after

¹ The above is found in the *Relations* of 1673-9, which were not published until 1860, when Mr. Shea printed them from a manuscript, fortunately preserved.

² Most likely those prisoners were only, or principally, women and children.

the instruction, they knelt down, and folding their hands called upon Jesus, 'the Master of Life,' concerning whom they had been taught.

"In the meantime, the Indians assembled in the French house, some with the intention to conclude peace with the Nadouessi, others to hinder its conclusion. Everything imaginable was done, to prevent those that entered from bringing their weapons with them; but, as the crowd was very large, five or six slipped in without having their knives taken from them. It was one of these, a Kilistinon, who gave rise to the slaughter that ensued; for, approaching a Nadouessi with knife in hand, he said, 'Thou art afraid,' threatening to strike him. The Nadouessi, not a whit disturbed, replied in a haughty tone and with tranquil mien, 'If thou thinkest that I tremble strike straight at the heart.' Receiving the thrust he shouted to those of his tribe, 'They kill us, brethren.' At these words, his companions, fired with vengeance and being of great size and strength, rose and attacked with their knives all the assembled Indians, without discriminating between Kilistinons or Sauteux, thinking that all had equally conspired to assassinate them. It was not very difficult for them to make a great slaughter in a short time, inasmuch as the crowd were unarmed and expected no such attack.

"The Kilistinon who had begun the fight was among the first stabbed, and fell dead on the floor, with several others. Then the Nadouessi placed themselves at the door of the house, to guard it and strike down those that might try to escape; but seeing that several had already slipped out and gone in search of arms, they closed the door, resolved to defend themselves to the last gasp.¹ They then stationed themselves at the windows and, as they had by chance found some guns and ammunition, they used them to keep off their enemies, who were going to burn them, by setting fire to the place in which they were inclosed. They killed some who advanced too near, but despite all their efforts, others approached the house, and, having placed straw and birch-bark canoes against it, set fire to them; which soon placed those inside in danger of being consumed by the flames. This obliged them to give a last proof of their courage; for the ten all rushed out, with weapons in hand, and with incredible swiftness threw themselves into a wooden hut which stood close by. From this they defended themselves and never ceased to kill as long as their supply of powder and lead lasted. This failing, they were overpowered by superior numbers, and were all killed on the spot, together with two women who had come with them. A third woman was spared, because she was discovered to be only their slave and an Algonquin by birth.

¹ It must be supposed that the Dacotas were by this time alone in the house.

"During all this tumult and slaughter, the fire which the Indians had set to the missionaries' house spread, and in spite of all that was done, soon consumed this building, and placed the new chapel, which was not far from it, in great danger of being also burned. They, however, succeeded in saving it. It was a frightful sight to behold so many dead and wounded in so narrow a space, to hear the moans of the dying and the shouting of those who encouraged each other in the fight, amid the confusion of an excited multitude who hardly knew what they were doing.

"Our Indians bewailed forty dead or wounded, among whom were some of their most prominent men; and the missionaries, on their part, had great cause for grief in being compelled to give up so soon the hope of going to preach the gospel to the Nadouessi, which the peace, on the point of being concluded, had led them to entertain. Moreover, they saw themselves abandoned by the Indians of that neighborhood. For, fearing lest the Nadouessi, finding that their people did not return, should suspect their fate and come to avenge them, they scattered and left the missionaries exposed to the fury of their enemies. Moreover, besides the danger to which they were exposed of being massacred, not only at the Falls but also in their other missions, the progress which the gospel had begun to make through their exertions has been greatly retarded for some time. In the meantime, God has not failed to derive glory from these misfortunes, and to make use of them, both for securing the salvation of some souls, and for showing the extraordinary effects of His omnipotence; for several of the dangerously wounded asked for baptism, and upon receiving it were healed of their wounds."

With this extract we conclude our selections from the early records. All we learn from later writers is that the Jesuits never succeeded in opening a Dacota mission. The machinations of their enemies very soon so reduced their numbers and trammelled their efficacy in the Algonquin missions, that instead of extending their sphere of action, they were compelled to greatly circumscribe it. A few isolated attempts, however, were made. Alluding to these Charlevoix says: "Two Jesuits, who in 1687 and 1689 made some excursions among them (the Sioux), spoke of them as a very powerful people; and one of them, Father Joseph Marest, often expressed to me his great regret that he was not enabled to take up his residence among those Indians, whom he found docile and reasonable. He added, that the Sioux did not inflict on their prisoners the horrors which disgrace most of the other Indian nations on this continent, and that they have a very distinct knowledge of the one, only God." Thirty years later Father Guignas tried to open a mission, of which we only know that it was closed almost as soon as

begun, the Father being compelled to retire, in consequence of a victory of the Foxes over the French.

On the other hand, there is a very full account of a well-known clerical traveller's experience among the Dacotas of the seventeenth century. Who has not heard of the *miles gloriosus* of western travels, poor Father Hennepin? There is nothing in his narrative—even if we take for granted the truth of every word—that would compel us to modify the good opinion our other sources of information have led us to form of the Dacotas' original character. Although the pusillanimity and puerility of this traveller—a missionary he hardly deserves to be called—could not fail to impress the Indians rather unfavorably, he was, on the whole, well enough treated by the Dacota band, in whose power he was and with whom he travelled, as a prisoner, from March or April to July, 1680. If we compare the treatment the first Jesuits in the West received at the hands of their Huron and Algonquin travelling companions, with the usage Hennepin complains of, the balance of humanity and politeness will be found entirely on the side of the Dacotas.¹

The colonization of Louisiana absorbed to a great extent the resources of the French, and withdrew their attention from their own interests and those of religion in the more remote Northwest, and prevented them from pushing their peaceable conquests beyond Lake Superior. The Dacotas who, like all the northwestern tribes, had consented to the Frenchmen's "taking possession" of their country (1689), seem to have greatly desired a closer alliance and more frequent intercourse with white men. They appear to have felt the apparent slight put on them. The following will serve as an illustration of their feelings in regard to this.

In 1693 the celebrated traveller, Le Sueur, erected a post at Chegoimegon, and renewed the alliance with the Dacotas. Two years later he went with a large convoy to Montreal, where the following incident occurred:

"While de Frontenac was giving orders to the Indians who had accompanied him, a Sioux chief approached with a very sad air, laid his hands on his knees, and with streaming eyes begged him to take pity on him; that all the other nations had their Father, and that he alone was like a forsaken child. He then spread out a beaver skin, on which he arranged twenty-two arrows, and taking them one after another, he named for each a village of his nation, and asked the general to take them all under his protection. This the Count de Frontenac promised; but since that time no means have been taken to retain the people in our alliance."

¹ See for the Recolect Friar Hennepin's literary character, writings, etc., J. G. Shea, *Discovery and Exploration of the Mississippi Valley*, which also contains a translation of Hennepin's *Narrative of his Voyage to the Upper Mississippi*.

When Charlevoix published the work from which we extract this passage (1744), it was well-nigh too late for France to cultivate the friendship of the Dacotas. The English power that soon supplanted her in Canada and the Northwest, had little communication with that distant tribe; though the English in their last struggle with our republic did not disdain the assistance of the Dacotas. Dacota warriors fought side by side with their Algonquin rivals in the war of 1812. The pithy speech of their chief, Wabasha, on Drummond Island, rejecting the paltry reward offered him by the defeated Britons, forms one of the well-known specimens of Indian oratory.

The year 1830 witnessed the first treaty between our government and the Dacota tribe. For a strip of land, running along the Iowa shore of the Mississippi, thirty miles in width, the sum of thirty thousand dollars, payable within ten years, was agreed to be paid. Five years later the first real Dacota mission was established: the honor belongs to the "American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions." The missionary force, after some time, consisted of two ministers, four female white teachers and one native teacher. After twenty years' uninterrupted labor the establishment counted forty-six converts, and fifty-four pupils attending school. How hopeful, despite such apparently slight results, the directors were, a few extracts from the official reports to the American Board of Commissioners will show.

The incumbent of the Hazlewood Mission, Minnesota, writes, on October 21st, 1856: "No Dacota school has been kept up at this station. About a year since our female boarding-school went into operation. In connection with this, an English school has been kept up during the entire year. This school, not intended to be large, has ranged from eight to ten during the year. As yet they have been chiefly half-breeds. There is more difficulty in obtaining full-blood Dacota girls than we anticipated. I have no doubt, however, we shall finally succeed."

The following is from the report of the Rev. S. R. Riggs, Dacota Indian Agent: "We congratulate ourselves and our Dacota friends on the formation of a new Dacota band on the principle of education, labor, and the adoption of the dress and habits of white men. This we regard as the gathering up of our missionary efforts for the last twenty years. It is a small beginning, but I regard it as the nucleus of an extensive movement in the right direction among the Dacotas."¹

¹ The Rev. Mr. Riggs has the merit of having given to the world the first Dacota grammar and dictionary, a most valuable work. There is quite a Dacota literature, consisting of school books, translations from the Scriptures, even a newspaper, etc. From the school reports it would appear that there are not many full-blood Dacotas able to read those works.

A cruel disappointment was in store for the patrons of this mission. Among those Dacotas that had adopted the dress and habits of white men was a young chief, named Little Crow. He held a conspicuous position among the converts, had a house built for him and a farm cultivated, at the expense of the tribe. He wore pantaloons, dress coat, and silk hat, up to August 17th, 1862, on which day he devoutly assisted at the sermon. On the following morning he appeared in the costume of a brave, painted and plumed, to inaugurate, at the head of thirteen hundred warriors, the massacre of that memorable year.¹

We cannot, and need not, stop to examine into the causes of that lamentable event, which, after all, happened quite opportunely for the lovers of broad acres in the fertile valley of the St. Peter's. For the natural consequence of the Dacota insurrection was the removal of the Minnesota bands farther west. Did the envoys of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions follow their little flock, or what remained of it, to their new homes in Dacota? We are unable to answer the question. At all events, if their labors since then have not been crowned with better success than they were previously, Protestant Christianity can scarcely be expected to reclaim and civilize that wild, nomad people. Will the United States Government be able to do it without the aid of religion? An able eastern publicist, who, as a champion of liberty and justice for all down-trodden races, has a full share of sympathy also for the Red Man, recommends to Congress, as the only feasible solution of the difficulty, "to deal with the Indians as a body of American citizens; to give them sufficient lands wherewith to support themselves; to furnish them with implements of agriculture, and send men among them who will instruct them in all the arts of civilized life."² This will never succeed with the Dacotas, unless, indeed, the men sent be of the race of those that, long ago and gradually, weaned a part of the western Algonquins from the pride, the indolence, the selfishness, and the superstitions of paganism, and thus prepared them for contact with European civilization. The transition from the wild hunter state to that of the agriculturist is a step of immense difficulty, which the prairie tribes will not be able to take without the inspiration and the supernatural helps of religion. This they themselves appear to feel, with the instinct of self-preservation. Hence their persevering and pressing calls for the Catholic black-gown. It is not of late only they have asked for him. For the last thirty or forty years they have entreated us

¹ For the above particulars, concerning Little Crow, we are indebted to one of the Jesuit fathers of Mankato, Min. See *Die Katholischen Missionen* (Illustrated Monthly), July, 1876.

² The Irish World, August 19th.

to take pity on them. About this fact there can be no question. But why has the United States Government not given them the teachers they asked for? Or, rather, why did these teachers not go to the Dacotas? For, to tell the truth and be just, until quite recently there was equal, or almost equal, freedom for all to go. In order to answer that serious, but also very delicate question, fairly and becomingly, we must crave the reader's patience for a short time. Instead, however, of speaking ourselves, we shall introduce two spokesmen of the highest authority, one of them among the noblest representatives of the American hierarchy, the other of our regular clergy.

Forty-three years ago the Demosthenes of the early Church in America, Bishop England, of Charleston, during a short stay at Vienna, addressed to the President of the Leopoldine Mission Society a very interesting *Summary of the State and Progress of the Catholic Church in the United States of North America*. In this little treatise he says, in regard to the Indian Mission,¹ "Great expectations were entertained in Europe concerning the conversion of innumerable Indians. Those who conceived such hopes had no opportunity to become acquainted either with the state of our own people or with that of the aborigines of America. In the first place, we were in want of priests to send on missions according to our own desire. Indeed, if with all our endeavors we were unable to satisfy the demands of the existing Catholics who called for the sacraments, we could not be expected to run in preference after those who had never heard of the name of Christ. Should any one not be satisfied with this explanation, let him consider the following: What would you think of the common sense of a priest who would leave children without baptism, his flock without Mass, his penitents without the means of reconciliation, and the dying without the helps of religion? Who would abandon new converts, and old confessors of the faith, because they are white, merely for the happy possibility of gaining savages to the faith, or imbuing some Indians with a few notions of Christianity. Deprived of means, as we were, we could not pursue both objects. We would rather consolidate and preserve the real good intrusted to our care, than lose everything by dividing our feeble forces; but now, that our seminaries are established and our means increase, we shall soon be able to take care of both the whites and of the red aborigines. In the second place, the political state of the Indians has thus far been exceedingly precarious. No one could tell how long such or such a tribe would remain on its grounds; and, generally speaking, it

¹ We translate from the German of the Annals of the Leopoldine Society. The italics are our own.

would not have been opportune to undertake their conversion, as long as these savages remained in their existing relation to the whites; that is, jealous and hostile, rather than friendly disposed. But now they are to leave their homes among the whites, and to be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the several States. After their transportation to different territories they will be placed under the protection of the General Government. *This will give the bishops a good opportunity at their next Provincial Council—and these are frequently held among us—to take proper action to make the conversion of the Indians a common cause, in which all will co-operate, and for which a part of the means coming to us from Europe will be employed.*"

This absolves the American Church, previous to 1833, or thereabout. No one could speak with a fuller knowledge of the subject than the learned and wise prelate who himself had led, and as a bishop still led, the life of a missionary among a widely-scattered Catholic population. A little incident, however, that seems to have a bearing on the same question, here comes to our recollection. Three years before Bishop England wrote that "Summary," a zealous and gifted young priest, only four months from Europe, travelled from Cincinnati to Detroit, visiting on his way many scattered Catholics, and administering the sacraments to the shepherdless flocks in Miamisburg and Dayton. He was destined for the Indian Mission; but the abandoned state of those poor white children of the Church, and of so many other souls who, he thought, might be gained for God, if they only had the truth announced them, so deeply moved him that for some time he seriously entertained the thought of requesting his bishop to allow him to remain in those regions as a travelling missionary. Had he acted upon this inspiration, or rather, yielded to the temptation, and had his bishop agreed to the request, the Catholics of Ohio would have had reason to congratulate themselves. That priest would certainly have done a great amount of good among them. But another work would have been left undone whose magnitude bears scarcely any proportion to whatever he might have accomplished among the whites of Ohio. The name of the zealous young priest was Frederic Baraga. But for him, humanly speaking, the Ottawa mission would have been nipped in the bud, the Ojibwa mission of Upper Michigan and Minnesota would never perhaps have been begun. For, with scarcely an exception, those that followed him in both these missions were attracted by his letters and his zeal. They built on foundations laid by him, being, at the same time, immensely helped by his Indian writings. And what is still more to our purpose, when the influx of the whites began in the regions evangelized by him, they not only had no trouble whatever with the Indians, but the thousands of Catholics among those new-comers, instead of

being for years exposed to the usual dangers of religious abandonment, were at once regularly visited, and soon provided with pastors and churches. The thought of what the going among the Dacotas forty years ago, of some other Baraga, and of his staying with them and drawing others after him, *in odorem unguentorum suorum*, would, with divine assistance, have accomplished, and what it would have prevented from being done, is simply overwhelming.

But why did no one go, or rather, no one stay among that tribe, after the conditions set down by Bishop England were fulfilled? Was there any opposition on the part of the Government? Did any other insurmountable obstacle exist? Was the soil considered too barren, or was there no hope of producing fruits in any way proportionate to the pecuniary and personal sacrifices demanded? To these questions the letters of one of the few who labored as transient visitors among the Dacotas and other northwestern tribes will furnish the answer.

In the year 1848, the *Las Casas* of North America, Father De Smet, made an excursion to the Upper Missouri for the express purpose of studying the disposition of the Dacotas, and ascertaining what hopes might be entertained in regard to the establishment of a mission among them. The result of his inquiries and the impressions received on his journey, are embodied in a series of letters to the Directors of the Association for the Propagation of the Faith, in Lyons and Paris.¹ From them we quote:

"It is a quite common observation, and I have myself heard it offered by several persons, that the 'religious as well as the social condition of the Indians of those regions is in nowise capable of amelioration.' I am far from participating in this opinion. Let the obstacles arising from the people who style themselves civilized, be removed; let all trade in ardent spirits, that deadly scourge of the Indian, be prevented; let missionaries be sent, whose zeal is prompted only by the love of our Divine Master, and with no object but the happiness of the poor souls intrusted to their care, and I am confident that in a short time we should have the consoling spectacle of a sensible improvement among them. My personal observations serve as a foundation for these hopes. I have had frequent interviews with the Blackfeet, the Crows, the Assiniboins, the Riccarees, and the Sioux. They have always lent the most marked attention to all my words; they have ever listened to the holy truths which I preached to them with extreme pleasure and a lively interest. They entreated me, with the most captivating ingenuousness, to take compassion on their miseries, to establish

¹ See *Western Missions and Missionaries. A Series of Letters by Rev. P. J. De Smet, of the Society of Jesus.* New York: James B. Kirker. 1863.

myself among them, promising to join a faithful practice to the knowledge of the truths I should impart to them. Among the Indians of the great American desert I never found even one who presumed to rail against our holy religion."

"As to agriculture, considered as a means of civilization, its introduction will always be difficult among the Indians, as long as there remains to them a hope of procuring buffaloes or other wild animals. It would prove, in my opinion, a chimera to pretend to introduce this branch of industry among them on an extensive scale in the beginning. We know, however, by experience, that, although little habituated to the fatigue of the assiduous labor that farming requires, some tribes have already attempted to cultivate their little fields. This step taken, each year, according to the abundance of the increase, the limits of these little fields might be extended. Like their brethren who reside west of the Rocky Mountains, they would become more and more attached to the soil whose productions would be the result of their toil. Their roving habits, the wars which often spring from them, would insensibly give place to a more peaceable and domestic life. The animals which they would raise, replacing the buffalo, would insensibly efface its memory amid surrounding plenty."

"There are among these Indians several hundreds of children of mixed blood, whose parents are anxious that means of instruction should be afforded them. To attain this, schools and establishments would be necessary, in which agriculture could be learned; and also many children of pure Indian blood could be received, as the heads of families are desirous of confiding them to the care of the missionaries. A few statistics will give you an idea of the good which might be done among these Indians. Among the Blackfeet, Father Point and myself baptized more than 1100 children; among the 'Gens du Sang,' a tribe of Blackfeet, M. Thibaut baptized 60; the Rev. M. Bellecourt, of Red River, visited Fort Berthold, on the Missouri, and baptized a good number of the children of the Mandans; all the savages presented him their children for baptism. F. Hocken, in an excursion made among several tribes on the Missouri, baptized over 400 persons; M. Ravoux, who visited some tribes of Sioux in 1847, and penetrated as far as Fort Pierre, was listened to everywhere with a consoling eagerness, and baptized a great many children. In my late tour among the Sioux, the Ponkahs, etc., I baptized more than 300 children and several adults."¹

¹ In regard to those children the saintly and heroic Father Christian Hocken, S. J., wrote, in 1850, to his Superior in St. Louis: "Do not imagine that the number of these poor children, all baptized by Father De Smet and others, is insignificant. The half-breeds exist in great numbers everywhere, with thousands of Indians. *Must all these*

The same father's *Journey to the Great Desert in 1851*, is also a rich depository of thought and information, pertinent to our purpose. In the fifth of the letters descriptive of that journey, after a few words on the ignorance, idolatry, sloth, and other vices of the prairie tribes, Father De Smet remarks :

" And still, amid this ocean of miseries, they feel an indescribable need of invoking a power superior to man. They listen attentively to any instruction which reveals to them the means of procuring His favor, and gives them information of His attributes. They love the missionary, and ever listen to him with delight ; and in his quality of priest they receive him with friendship and respect. To judge by the respect and friendship shown me as a priest, on all occasions, by the Indians on the Upper Missouri, I am satisfied that if a few zealous priests were stationed here, these Indians would soon become generous Christians, full of zeal and ardor for the glory of our God and His holy law. ' They would know their Father who is in heaven, and Him whom He has sent on earth ; ' they would become faithful disciples of the Redeemer, who so ardently desires the salvation of all, and who did not disdain to shed His blood for them on the cross."

In the ninth letter, of July 28th, 1854, he writes : " Vocations, alas ! are still extremely rare. We must have ecclesiastics from Europe to go to the aid of the benighted Indians, who are without guide or pastor, and always desirous and anxious for them."

Quotations could be multiplied almost *ad infinitum* ; but these suffice. The last extract gives us the key to the solution of the whole question. *Vocations are extremely rare !* The road was open, the welcome sure, and the harvest certain. But, " they asked for bread, and there was none to break it to them."

Will the lesson of this summer open our eyes ? Among the

children, of whom several thousand have already received holy baptism, perish for want of instruction ? Are they doomed to remain sitting in the shadow of death ? May I not announce to them all, the precious tidings of vocation to grace ? I trust, in God's mercy, the day of their deliverance is at hand ; that they will soon perceive the aid of the Saviour and Redeemer. My daily prayer is (above all at the Holy Altar) that their expectations and frequent appeals may at length find fulfilment." In another letter the same father relates : " The Brûlés, the Yanctons, and the other Sioux tribes, assembled in council, said : ' The missionaries shall not perish with hunger among us ; we will bring them an abundance of buffalo robes and buffalo meat, so that they can purchase clothes for the children who will be confided to them.' " And then he continues : " For the love of God and of souls, I conjure you, Reverend Father, not to defer any longer. All the good that Father De Smet and others have produced by their labors and visits will be lost and forgotten, if these Indians are disappointed in their expectations. They weigh men's characters in the balance of honesty. In their eyes whosoever does not fulfil his promises is culpable. They do not regard or consider whether it be done for good reasons, or that there is an impossibility in the execution. Some of them have sent their children to Protestant schools, and they will continue to do so as long as we form no establishment among them."

warriors that gather around Sitting Bull—himself, it is reported, baptized by Father De Smet—there are the young men over whose heads, when children, the fountain of regeneration has flowed, but whose minds have been left in the darkness of paganism.

Shall we go on recounting what we have done among the Indians, and inveighing against the injustice of our government and the corruptions in high places that perpetuate Indian troubles and threaten the extinction of the race? Perhaps, if we humble ourselves and confess our own share in the tremendous responsibility, there will be given us at the end of this present war a better opportunity than ever, to enter upon the long-neglected field of the Dacota mission, and procure for that tribe, should it be doomed to destruction, at least the benefit of a national euthanasia. To obviate their final demise, may not be in our power; but we may, with God's help, do something to prevent their dying in paganism.

There is a germ of hope in the existence of a young Catholic Dacota mission, at Fort Totten, with a residing priest and a school under Sisters of Charity of Montreal. Its influence on the temporal progress of the Indians that belong to it has already been favorably noticed by the press. *Vivat, floreat, crescat!* May the future of this mission be the fulfilment of the hopes of Allouez, Druillettes, and Marest!¹

APPENDIX TO THE FOREGOING ARTICLE.

A COMPARATIVE VOCABULARY OF THE DACOTA LANGUAGE AND THE NON-ARYAN TONGUES OF INDIA.

LITERATURE.—1. *Grammar and Dictionary of the Dacota Language.* Collected by the members of the Dakota Mission. Edited by Rev. S. R. Riggs, A.M., Washington City. Published by the Smithsonian Institute, 1852.

2. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Languages of India and High Asia, with a Dissertation.* By W. W. Hunter, B.A., M.R.A.S. London: Trübner & Co., 1868.

REMARKS.—The diacritical marks, in both the Dacota, and the languages of India, will have to be omitted for the want of type; wherever essential, the defect will be supplied by a change in the orthography. All the vowels have the Italian sound, g always the hard sound. In the Dacota, ng gives the preceding vowel a nasal sound. The first word in each line is Dacota.

ABBREVIATIONS.—S. and T., Siam and Tenasserim; C. I., Central India; S. I., Southern India; Ch. F., Chinese Frontier and Thibet; A. and B., Arrakan and Burmah; B., Bengal. All words not thus marked, belong to dialects spoken in *Nepaul*.

AHI, to bring. *Kusunda*, AHI.

APA, to strike. *Khamti*, S. and T., po. (*Amoy*, PAH.)

BOTA, to kill. *Rajmahali*, C. I., PITTA.

EHDAKU, to take. *Vayu*, DOKO. *Kurumba*, S. I., TEGI. *Manyak*, Ch. F., DANGO.

HIVO, to come. *Thochu*, Ch. F., HAI. *Sgan-Karen*, S. and T., HAI.

IHA, to laugh. *Kiranti*, IYA.

¹ The above had left the writer's hands when information was received that at last one of the older orders is about opening an Indian mission in Dacota Territory. If the report proves true a great step towards the solution of the Indian question will have been taken.

IOTANKA, to sit down. *Singpho*, *B.*, DUNGU. *Sibsagar Miri*, *B.*, DUTOKA. (*Thibetan*, HDUG.)

KU, to give. *Namsang Naga*, *B.*, *KU*.

NAHON (NAKIHONG), to hear. *Gau-karen*, *S.* and *T.*, NAHHU. *Pwo-karen*, *S.* and *T.*, NAHGUNG.

UWA, to come. *Tharu*, *AWA*. *Newar*, *WA*.

YA, to go. *Denwar*, *YA*. *Sokpa*, *Ch. F.*, *YA BU*. *Gurung*, *YAD*. *Manyak*, *Ch. F.*, *YU*. (*Sanskrit*, *YA*.)

YUKCHANG, to understand. *Thochu*, *Ch. F.*, AKHCHAN.

CHEPA, fat. *Gurung*, *CHOB*A. *Waling*, *CHIPTO*.

CHIKADANG, small. *Newar*, *CHIGO*. *Pahri*, *CHIGIDHAGU*. (*Bask*, *CHIKI*.)

DIDITA, hot. *Chepang*, *DHATO*. *Churasya*, *Dahri*, *Kuswar*, *TATO*.

DUTA, red. *Chepang*, *DUTO*.

KATA, hot. *Talain*, *S.* and *T.*, *KATA*. *Rutluk*, *C. I.*, *KASTA*. *Irula*, *S. I.*, *KAJA*.

KATKUDANG, short. *Denwar*, *KHATO*. *Singpho*, *B.*, *KUTUN*.

MDAMDATA, flat. *Nowgong Naga*, *B.*, *MATAM*. *Tengsa Naga*, *B.*, *MADAMKA*.

MDOKITA, weary. *Ho*, *C. I.*, *TAGAUTEA* (weariness).

PAKO, crooked. *Sunwar*, *BANGO*. *Waling*, *BANGGO*. *Newar*, *BEKO*. *Denwar*, *BANKA*.

SAKA, raw. *Dhimal*, *B.*, *SINKHA*. (*Chinese*, *SANG*.)

SAPA, black. *Tuluva*, *S. I.*, *KHAPA*.

SKUYA, sour. *Lambichhong*, *SUYUKHA*. *Yakha*, *SUHA*.

SNI, cold. *Angami Naga*, *B.*, *SI*.

TANKA, great. *Dhimal*, *THAMKA*. *Newar*, *TA-GU*. *Chingtangya*, *THEKHA*.

TEHANG, long. *Newar*, *TAHA*. *Pahri*, *TAHAGU*. *Gyami*, *Ch. F.*, *THANGTI*.

APE (WAPA), leaf. *Newar*, *LAPTE*. *Sunwar*, *SAPHA*.

CHANG, tree. *Chingtangya*, *SANG*. *Waling*, *SANG U*.

CHANGKU, road. *Sokpa*, *Ch. F.*, *CHAM*. *Angami Naga*, *B.*, *CHAH*.

CHAPONGKA, mosquito. *Pakhya*, *POKHA*.

CHEKU (UKA), skin. *Dumi Khaling*, *SAKA*. *Rungchenbung*, *HOKWA*.

HI, tooth. *Yakha*, *HA*.

HOKUWA, fish. *Ho*, *Kol*, *Mundala*, *C. I.*, *HAKU*.

HING, hair. *Deoria Chutia*, *KING*.

HU, bone. *Kusunda*, *KOU*. *Vayu*, *RU*. (*Chinese*, *KUH*.)

I, mouth. *Thulungya*, *SI*.

IHDII (SDA), oil (fat, grease). *Magar*, *SIDI*.

INA, mother. *Yakha*, *Munipuri*, *IMA*. *Ho*, *C. I.*, *ENGA*.

MAKA, earth. *Kiranti*, *Runchenbung*, *Lohorong*, etc., *BAKHA*. *Waling*, *PAKHA*.

NAGPA (NOGE), ear. *Thochu*, *NUKH*. *Sunwar*, *NOPHA*. *Manyak*, *NAPI*. *Murmi*, *NAPE*. *Magar*, *NA-KYEP*. *Tulungya*, *NOKPHLA*. *Lohorong*, *NABA*.

NAPE, hand. *Bhutani*, *IAPPA*.

ODONGWE, village. *Youngh-thu*, *S.* and *T.*, *DUNG*. *Rodong*, *TUNGMA*. *Waling*, *TENG*.

PAHA, mountain. *Denwar*, *PAKHA*.

SIHA, foot. *Dumi*, *SYAB*. *Khaling*, *SYAL*.

WAKIYE, bird. *Tulnoa*, *S. I.*, *HAKKI*.

WE, blood. *Chepang*, *WE-I*. *Vayu*, *Sikkim*, *VI*. *Mru.*, *A.* and *B.*, *WI*. (*Burman*, *SWE*.)

AKAN, above. *Namsang Naga*, *B.*, *AKHONANG*. *Kami*, *A-KOUNG-BE*.

DEHAN, to-day. *Santali*, *C. I.*, *TEHENG*. *Mundala*, *C. I.*, *TEHIN*.

DETU, here. *Bhutani*, *DITE*. *Horpa*, *UDU*. (*Chinese*, *TI-TEH*. *Brahui*, *DADE*.)

ETANGHANG, from. *Kiranti*, *DANKA*. *Rungchenbung*, *DANKA*. *Abor Miri*, *ODANKANG*.

HANG (ho), yes. *Waling*, *HANAN*. *Col*, *C. I.*, *HAN*. *Santali*, *C. I.*, *HUNG*. *Magar*, *HO*. *Pakhya*, *HOHO*.

HIYA, no. *Deoria Chutia*, HOYA. *Khyeng, A. and B.*, HIA. (Japanese, IYA.)
KA, and. *Tharu*, KA. *Pahri*, KHA. *Chentsu*, C. I., KE.
KEHANG, when. *Chentsu*, C. I., KEKHAN. *Sunwar*, GENA. *Denwar*, KANHIN.
KIYEDANG, near. *Tamil, Irula, Malabar*, S. I., KITTA.
KUYA, below. *Uraon*, C. I., KIYAH. *Waling*, AKHUKYU.
NAKAHA, now. *Mundala*, C. I., NAHA. *Kahling*, ANAGNA.
OTA, much. *Sanig-pang*, OTTO. *Santali*, C. I., ATUA. *Vayu*, HA-TA (how much?)
TEHANG, far. *Chepang*, DYANG-TO.
TOKETU, how. *Nachhereng*, DAKHTO.
WANGNA, now. *Balati*, HOGNO.

IS (IVE), he. *Kusunda*, ISI. *Denwar*, I. *Tuluva*, S. I., AYE. (Chinese, YI. *Malay*, IYA.)
MISH (MA), I. *Sokpa*, MI. *Pakhya*, MA. *Darki*, MA-I.
NISH (NIYE), thou. *Kota*, S. I., NI-YE. *Uraon*, C. I., NI-EN. *Gyami*, NI. (Chinese, NI.)
NITA, thine. *Gyami*, NI-TI. *Telegu*, NIDI. (Chinese, NI-THI.)
TAKU, what. *Rodong*, DAKO. *Dungmali*, TIGO. *Waling*, TIKWA.
TAKU, anything. *Manyak*, TAKA. *Keikadi*, C. I., YEDAGAO.
UNGKITA, our. *Badaga*, S. I., YENGADU. *Waling*, ANG-KAPIK. *Dungmali*, ANG-CHAGA.
UNGKIYE, we. *Rungchenbung*, UNG-KAN. *Kiranti*, ANKAN. *Chourasya*, UNGGU-TICHA.
WANGZHI, one. *Madi*, C. I., WANDI. *Rutluk*, WUNDI.

HOW SHALL WE MEET THE SCIENTIFIC HERESIES OF THE DAY?

European Civilization; Protestantism and Catholicity Compared. By
Rev. J. Balmes. Baltimore: Murphy & Co. 1866.

History of Civilization. By F. Guizot. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1850.

IT has not been more than seven years ago since it was generally and confidently represented that the Catholic Church was an effete institution, whose days of usefulness had passed, and which lacked only some exigency to demonstrate the utter absence, in her, of any principle of stability. This was so signally manifest as to justify the successive predictions, that the convening of the *Œcumical Council*, and the definition of the dogma of *Infallibility*, would amply suffice to resolve her into a thousand discordant elements. That she did not so collapse—that she presented to view a unity of spirit and of action unprecedented in the history of the world, bespeaks, in her, a reprehensible defiance of the laws of existence which those interested in the study of her decadence were pleased to assign her. Of late years—since the adjournment of the Council—we have not been favored with any of these gloomy predictions. The shoe now appears to pinch the other foot. The

greatest danger to the liberties of mankind, and to the advance of the intellect, is to be apprehended from the existence of an institution which has lately given such signal proofs that she has lost none of the vigor which she displayed during the middle ages. She is averse to innovation ; she is the great impediment to the progress of civilization ; therefore she must be remorselessly attacked.

Attack follows attack, from every quarter ; and even the circumstance that her enemies oppose her with theories mutually irreconcilable, does not seem to impair in the least the harmony of the onslaught. They fraternize, in the face of the common foe, as cordially as hearts that beat as one. The melancholy burden to which all these attacks are attuned, is that she wantonly opposes the generous spirit of every age. This solemn dirge—caught from their unhappy master—breaks out in mystic refrain at every utterance. She disclaims the imputation ; and appeals to her own professions, and to the record of ages. The only response she is vouchsafed, is—Thought, Thought, Thought. To this entity they pay divine honors, make it the infallible arbiter of truth and falsehood, of good and evil ; and, when it tricks them, makes sport of their longings, refuses to aid them, and casts them upon the shores of the “Unknowable,” they even then dare not question its rights to an apotheosis, but, in awe and trembling, sink their voices to a whisper, and increase their adoration by bowing down before their God, with all the fervor shown by a savage to his fetish.

It is a source of unfeigned regret that the adversaries of the Church should differ with us. But how is it to be remedied ? Most assuredly not by following their suggestions ; for, were it consistent with our principles, to reconcile the Church with “modern thought,” we would be unable to conceive by what means we should bring it about. If she adopted the tenets of one set of philosophers, she would still retain the undying hatred of the thousand and one other schools which are united together only by the bond of a common opposition to her. Even our newly-made brethren, finding their occupation gone, would cherish for her no kindly feelings, but, one by one, silently steal away to the camps of the allied forces. And so on, *mutatis mutandis*, until she had swung the whole circuit, all her efforts at reconciliation brought to naught.

The one department of knowledge in which the least successful attack has been made, is that styled the philosophy of history. It has been found impossible to gainsay the importance of the Church as a factor in the development of civilization. Each unfriendly writer is constrained to say a word in her favor ; and the most amusing feature is, that we need only to extract from the tomes of each of them the several tributes which they respectively pay to the genius of the Church, and marshal them in array ; and there

will be found to be absolutely no room left for the operation of other causes! The reason is, that each of these masters of the philosophy of history is more than honest in assigning a specific influence to the Church, in order to wing his hostile shaft with a show of impartiality. The result is, that the aggregate effect of this politic generosity is wholly to preclude the concurrence of those natural factors which we all know played prominent parts in the progress of civilization.

These theories of civilization all gain in attractiveness and repute, in proportion as they wear the livery of heterodoxy. The degree of departure from Catholic truth, constitutes the measure of the ability which they severally display. Conspicuous among those engaged in the task of distorting facts to the prejudice of Catholicity, is M. Guizot. Too consummate an artist not to recognize that it is *from* the true purpose of misrepresentation to bestow unqualified censure upon that which he would attack, he adroitly and skilfully insinuates, here and there, among the encomiums which he pays the Church, masterly and delicate touches which, well worked up, develop, by a seemingly fair process, into the grand *denouement* which he has had ever in view, viz., that out of the needs and shortcomings of Catholicity, was normally evolved Protestantism. We desire here to draw attention to one of these preparations for the attainment of his brilliant climax.

He says:

“All this seemed greatly in favor of the Church, of its unity, and of its power. While, however, the popes of Rome sought to usurp the government of the world, while the monasteries enforced a better code of morals and a severer form of discipline, a few mighty, though solitary individuals, protested in favor of human reason, and asserted its claim to be heard, its right to be consulted, in the formation of man’s opinions. The greater part of these philosophers forbore to attack commonly received opinions—I mean religious creeds; all they claimed for human reason was the right to be heard—all they declared was, that she had the right to try these truths by her own tests, and that it was not enough that they should be merely affirmed by authority. John Erigena, or John Scotus, as he is more frequently called, Roscelin, Abelard, and others, became the noble interpreters of individual reason, when it now began to claim its lawful inheritance. It was the teaching and writings of these giants of their days that first put in motion that desire for intellectual liberty, which kept pace with the reform of Gregory VII. and St. Bernard. If we examine the general character of this movement of mind, we shall find that it sought not a change of opinion, that it did not array itself against the received system of faith; but that it simply advocated the right of reason to work for itself—in short, the right of free inquiry. The importance of this first attempt after liberty, or this re-birth of the spirit of free inquiry, was not long in making itself felt. Though busied with its own reform, the Church soon took the alarm, and at once declared war against these new reformers, *whose methods gave it more reason to fear than their doctrines.*” Pp. 147-8.

Guizot here intimates that not only does the Church require our belief in her dogmas, but that, in outrageous violation of the freedom of thought, she prescribes the very operations of the mind in as-

senting thereto, and in comprehending them; that she furnishes the very logic by which we are bound to harmonize them with the relations of the natural order; that she enjoins upon us the principles upon which rest their reciprocal dependence; that she reprobates the practice of using other methods, even though they should lead to orthodox results; and, in fine, that she authoritatively maps out all the highways, byways, lanes, and footpaths of the whole domain of thought, so as wholly to preclude all originality or progress in the natural order. He charges that it was the exercise of reason otherwise than in the approved grooves, and not merely the perversion of essential doctrines, which she feared. He contends that the Church discountenanced and feared any departure from the set canons of logic, however innocent of heresy or of schism such a course might be. To judge from Guizot's portrayal of the character of this intellectual movement, one would presume that a philosopher, in the middle ages—or, by implication now—dared not propound to himself a speculative problem, such as: Given certain established principles of the natural order, what is the conformity of the philosophic result with a certain dogma? but, that dogma, philosophic result, and mode of attaining that result were alike given by the Church, and to be followed by the faithful, under peril of temporal and eternal damnation.

In refutation of Guizot's skilfully preferred declaration, that Erigena, Roscelin, and Abelard "forbore to attack commonly received opinions—I mean religious creeds;" that they "sought not a change of opinion," and "did not array" themselves "against the received system of faith;" Balmes adduces evidence to the contrary, so conclusive that Guizot's knowledge of history can only be vindicated at the expense of his good faith. Balmes shows, beyond all possibility of question, that these individuals held and maintained doctrines which were in direct and unmistakable conflict with the most salient dogmas of the faith; and that it was for stolidly persisting in the dissemination of these errors, and for that alone, for which they were condemned. Erigena broached and maintained erroneous doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist, of predestination, and of grace. Roscelin called into question the sacred mystery of the Trinity. Abelard held and maintained the opinions of Arius on the Trinity; those of Nestorius on the Incarnation; and those of Pelagius on grace. "All this," says Balmes, "did not merely tend to a radical change of doctrine, but actually was one."

The *gravamen* of Guizot's charge is plainly expressed in the sentence wherein he says, their "methods gave her (the Church) more reason to fear than their doctrines." Now, the Church proscribes no method. Methods rise and fall in the Church, as elsewhere;

spring into existence, coexist, attain to greater or less influence, and fall into desuetude. The history of the Catholic Church is a history of methods, and, in this *Review*, even, can be discerned the impress, respectively, of the scholastic, Platonic, and modern or so-called scientific method. The Platonic, the neo-Platonic, the scholastic, the "scientific," with all their countless shades and modifications, have ruled and swayed the intellects of the Church. The beauty of Catholic thought is, that having fixed principles of belief, it is able, upon any method, to attain to a scientific coherency impossible with those beaten about by the waves of thought which ever threaten submersion, when not regulated by some compass or rudder. It has been asserted that the belief in revelation, and in the authority of the Church, restricts and cramps the exercise of the intellect. With equal propriety could it be alleged that the use of the compass militates against the operation of the laws of the elements. Thought is not the less free because it is enlightened.

The Church requires the acceptance of the *credenda*; but it matters not to her whether the dogmas essential to salvation are received in gross, or whether they are marshalled in conformity with analytic, synthetic, "scientific," or other views of philosophy. True it is, she at times favors the pursuance of a special method; but she condemns none. Truth is one; and the very fact that a course constitutes a method, implies that it possesses some of the coherency and consistency of truth. If, then, the principles which give body and form to a method are examined and followed out, the result must be the confirmation of Catholic doctrine.

A variety of methods now obtain in the Church, and coexist with perfect harmony of belief. The motto of the Church is, "*In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas.*" One school comprises those who contend that our general ideas are furnished by the mind alone; that they are directly seen by the mind, and are acquired neither through the senses nor by reflection. The genius of this school is synthetic, and deeming itself endowed, *a priori*, with principles which underlie all knowledge, it regards as feasible the scientific explication of the nexus subsisting between the natural and the supernatural, and the formation of the two orders and their mutual relations into a synthetic whole. Those of another school declare that the natural intellect cannot acquire ideas independently of sensation. They contend that, as our modes of thought, criteria, and canons of logic, are the outcome of the natural order, they can acquaint us with the supernatural only in distinct and separate sections, and not to the extent necessary to enable us to embrace it within a synthesis, or to apprehend, scientifically, the nature of the nexus which binds the whole. They concede that the Creator's works form a complete and harmonious whole, and that the natu-

ral has its complement or fulfilment in the supernatural. They contend, however, that it is impossible to gauge the relations of the two orders with anything like precision; and deny that the knowledge of the supernatural is susceptible of a continual and indefinite progress, corresponding with the advancement of our knowledge of philosophy.

Although these methods, as above given, are not in perfect harmony with the prevailing tone of philosophic thought in the Church, they are yet permissible. The Church has ever deemed it wise and just to refrain from any condemnation of a method, however much it may fail to chime in with the views of the major portion of her doctors. If, however, the method tolerated works out a result in conflict with any portion of her sacred deposit of truth, she visits with her censure the incongruous product; but leaves the rest of the method as much intact as is compatible with the truncation of its condemned corollary. This policy is impartially extended to the method for which she may display a preference. It is not the exercise of the intellect in a manner productive of heretical results which the Church visits with her censure. It is the promulgation of the resultant fallacy, with a view to disturb the convictions of the faithful, which constitutes the offence.

In pursuance of his answer to Guizot, Balmes says:

“Still the same confusion of ideas. I have said already, and must repeat here that the Church has condemned no method; it was not a *method*, but error, that the Church condemned, unless by a method be meant an assault upon the articles of faith, under pretence of breaking the fetters of authority, which is not merely a method, but an error of the very highest import. In reproving a pernicious doctrine, subversive of all faith, and denying the infallibility of the See of St. Peter in matters of doctrine, the Church did not put forth any new pretensions; her conduct has always been the same ever since the time of the apostles, and is the same still. The moment a doctrine is propagated that appears in the least degree dangerous, the Church examines, compares it with the sacred deposit of faith confided to her: if the doctrine is not inconsistent with divine truth, she allows it free circulation, for she is not ignorant that *God has given up the world to the controversies of men*; but if it is opposed to the faith, its condemnation is irremissible, without concern or regret. Were the Church to act otherwise, she would contradict herself, and cease to be what she is, the jealous depository of divine truth. If she allowed her infallible authority to be questioned, that moment she would forget one of her most sacred obligations, and would lose all claim on our belief; for, in betraying an indifference for truth, she would prove herself to be no longer a religion descended from Heaven, but a mere delusion.”

The most telling commentary upon Guizot’s charge is, that the method for the alleged suppression of which he arraigns the Church, is the very method which has been incorporated into her philosophy, and to which she has extended her greatest favors. Those “solitary, though mighty individuals,” were not the inaugurators of this mode of thought. Erigena lived in the ninth century, wherein philosophy was a strange compound of Grecian eclecticism and

Christian ideas, with Platonism acting the *rôle* of a co-ordinating principle. Erigena differed with his contemporaries in no respect, save in his heterodox conclusions. The succeeding century was the darkest period of ignorance, during the middle ages. In the eleventh century, in which Roscelin and Abelard flourished, this method of thought had sprung into existence, challenged the attention of the Doctors of the Church, and commanded the sympathies of hundreds of the faithful, long before Roscelin or Abelard made their entrance on the intellectual arena. The process of reasoning which it inculcated, had been imported from Spain into Catholic Europe, by the perusal of the writings of Averroes, Avicenna, and other Moorish philosophers, who had displayed a dialectical superiority over their Christian adversaries by reason of the consistency and beauty of their philosophy. In Roscelin and Abelard's time, however, the introduction of this mode of thought was not complete, but formed only an ingredient in a bizarre mixture of incongruous methods, which were eminently calculated to lead to erroneous results. This method, which Guizot so much lauds, was, and is, none other than the Aristotelian philosophy which, at the epoch in question, was fast attaining to the reputation in which the Church afterwards held it. It is, indeed, the identical method which, for nearly three centuries, has constituted the stock reproach to the Church. Starting with the Stagyrite, it found a congenial home with those consummate mathematicians, the Arabians. It was the efficient means by which the Moors were enabled to attain to such progress in the natural sciences. Among the Catholics, its reception was first hailed with pleasure by those engaged in physical investigations. St. Thomas Aquinas, himself brought up in the physical school under the direction of Albertus Magnus, demonstrated its almost infinite capabilities by using it for the elaboration of Catholic doctrine into a symmetrical whole. In the works of the Angelic Doctor it found its crowning result; and this very method to which Guizot would have us believe the Church was instinctively and irreconcilably averse, shared with the Holy Scriptures the honor of informing the conscience of the Council of Trent.

To this method is ascribable whatever of truth or value appears in the labors of Leibnitz, Descartes, Bacon, Locke, and the modern scientists. It is a fact which cannot be disguised, that whenever science departs from its true paths, the departure is in a direct ratio with the relinquishment of this method. Platonic ideas then crop out, and truth suffers in proportion.

History proves, beyond a reasonable doubt, that this philosophical method which has prevailed in the Church for nearly eight centuries, has conclusively established its applicability to every department of thought. The possession of a suitable method, how-

ever, is not sufficient. A knowledge of the field to which it is to be applied is equally necessary. It must be admitted that here, in America, our acquaintance with the prevailing controversies is not commensurate with the efficiency of our method. It becomes incumbent on us to guard vigilantly against the springing up of a literature and mode of thought tinctured with modern infidelity. We are all aware how the small Catholic representation we have had in English-speaking countries, for the last three centuries, has suffered the dissemination of prejudices hostile to our religion. We are all sensible of the Augean task involved in the dissipation of that evil. Now, this taint, with which English and American literature has been sullied by Protestant misrepresentation, must not be allowed to repeat itself in another shape.

The numberless discoveries now being made in the natural sciences are opening up before us wide vistas of thought, in which those bent on tracing a want of harmony between science and religion, are allowed to disport themselves without control or hindrance, and to misinterpret every phenomenon into an argument in favor of infidelity. These men stand at the portals of science, and brand with their pernicious stamp every fact as it is developed. They even levy contributions upon the rich treasures of intellectual gold stored amid the tomes of the middle ages; and surreptitiously convert them into the current coin of the age, whilst affecting to hold them in supreme contempt. The evil is spreading here in America, silently and slowly, but most extensively. In Europe, the expression of disbelief is, in some degree, a measure of its extent. But in this country it is otherwise. The affected deference to religious prejudices, and absence of the spirit of proselytism—which are said to be characteristic of the movement—obtain here more fully. This only increases the danger. There is scarce an intellectual coterie in America in which it is not possible for a person conversant with the signs of the times, to discern the extent of the ravages of this deadly gangrene.

Now, this intellectual activity must not be allowed to pursue the false direction which it is taking. The antidote must be made to develop concurrently with the bane. To our mind, there exists an imperious necessity for the cultivation, in our seminaries, of the mathematical and physical sciences. There is no need, or occasion, for anything like a change in the method at present prevailing in the Church. That method is the daughter of the natural sciences, and nowhere has it found a more congenial field of action than amid questions akin to those which at present agitate society. Change it not; but extend its application to the complexion of the present time. Let it be recognized that the site of the battle-field has been shifted. Let it be remembered that the intellectual activity of the

Church has ever manifested itself in the direction whence the attack came. This has been evident in every age; in the time of St. Thomas, when a spurious Aristotelianism was threatening the faithful; and especially at the epoch of the Reformation. The Society of Jesus then appeared on the scene, and combated the evil with the very means by which it was propagated. How far the methods adopted by the Jesuits point the moral indicated in this article, we prefer to let Balmes and Macaulay show.

Balmes says, p. 269 :

“When we fix our attention on the institute of the Jesuits, on the time of its foundation, on the rapidity and greatness of its progress, we find the important truth which I have before pointed out more and more confirmed, viz., that the Catholic Church, with wonderful fruitfulness, always furnishes an idea worthy of her to meet all the necessities which arise. Protestantism opposed the Catholic doctrines with the pomp and parade of knowledge and learning; the *éclat* of human literature, the knowledge of languages, the taste for the models of antiquity, were all employed against religion with a constancy and ardor worthy of a better cause. Incredible efforts were made to destroy the pontifical authority. When they could not destroy it they attempted at least to weaken and discredit it. The evil spread with fearful rapidity. The mortal poison already circulated in the veins of a considerable portion of the European nations; the contagion began to be propagated even in countries which had remained faithful to the truth. To complete the misfortune, schism and heresy, traversing the seas, corrupted the faith of the simple neophytes of the New World. What was to be done in such a crisis? Could such great evils be remedied by ordinary means? Was it possible to make head against such great and imminent perils by employing common arms? Was it not proper to make some on purpose for such a struggle, to temper the cuirass and the shield, to fit them for this new kind of warfare, in order that the cause of truth might not appear in the new arena under fatal disadvantages? Who can doubt that the appearance of the Jesuits was the answer to these questions, that their institute was the solution of the problem?

“The spirit of the coming ages was essentially one of scientific and literary progress. The Jesuits were aware of this truth: they perfectly understood it.

“It was necessary to advance with rapidity and never to remain behind. This the new institute does; it takes the lead in all sciences; it allows none to anticipate it. Men study the Oriental languages; they produce great works on the Bible; they search the books of the ancient Fathers, the monuments of tradition and of ecclesiastical decisions; in the midst of this great activity the Jesuits are at their posts; many super-eminent works issue from their colleges. The taste for dogmatical controversy is spread over all Europe; many schools preserve and love the scholastic discussions; immortal works of controversy come from the hands of the Jesuits, at the same time they yield to none in skill and penetration in the schools. The mathematics, astronomy, all the natural sciences, make great progress; learned societies are formed in the capitals of Europe to cultivate and encourage them; in these societies the Jesuits figure in the first rank.”

Macaulay says, ch. vi. :

“When the Jesuits came to the rescue of the papacy they found it in extreme peril; but from that moment the tide of battle turned. Protestantism, which had, during the whole generation, carried all before it, was stopped in its progress, and rapidly beaten back from the foot of the Alps to the shores of the Baltic. Before the order had existed a hundred years, it had filled the whole world with memorials of great things done and suffered for the faith. No religious community could produce a list of men so variously distinguished; none had extended its operations over so vast a space; yet

in none had there ever been such perfect unity of feeling and action. There was no region of the globe, no walk of speculative or of active life, in which Jesuits were not to be found. They guided the counsels of kings. They deciphered Latin inscriptions. They observed the motions of Jupiter's satellites. They published whole libraries, controversy, casuistry, history, treatises on optics, Alcaic odes, editions of the fathers, madrigals, catechisms, and lampoons. The liberal education of youth passed entirely into their hands, and was conducted by them with conspicuous ability."

In England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain, the education of the clergy is fast being regulated with a view to the correction of the crying evil of the day. The necessity becomes the greater here in America, when we recognize the fact that the "Tractarian movement" has not as yet spent itself, but is only in abeyance, awaiting the issue of the conflict between Catholicity and infidelity. There are hundreds who are fully convinced that Protestantism is a failure, both logically and practically, but who shrink from communion with the fold, in fear lest when they resolve one doubt, they shall be confronted with another respecting the creation and moral government of the universe. In this state of hesitancy, one so situated is subjected to influences which insensibly create a bias hostile to religion. Unless he chances to meet with one of those few priests whose intercourse with the current of European thought has led him to the study of these problems, he will probably go away with his doubts undispersed. Not that the priest has not at hand, in the form of principle, the needed remedy, but because the person in doubt requires a specific application of the principle to his own intellectual difficulties. It is true that the errors of "modern thought" are not new. They are, at bottom, nothing more than a revamping of old materialistic heresies under new forms and with a changed terminology, often and long ago exploded; but the necessity of refuting these errors under their new forms and in their relation to the science of the day is not, on this account, the less urgent. What will a consideration of the heresies of the Monophysites, the Eutychians, or the Arians, avail a person confused by the specious doctrines of "modern scientists?" Can he counteract the malaria which everywhere surrounds him, and of whose baneful influence he is only vaguely conscious, by listening to a masterly disquisition upon the pernicious effects of the Manichean heresy? How can tone be given to his mind by a recapitulation of the countless absurdities and evils which emanated from that Pandora box, yclept the Reformation? Of what value to him are those stores of Biblical and Patristic knowledge, which so signally proved their usefulness during and succeeding the Tractarian movement, to dissipate those incipient misgivings which harass and trouble him? No; his ailment, inasmuch as it has taken a different direction, requires a different remedy, having some relation to that which it is designed to correct.

The Jesuits, we rejoice to see, are evincing their sense of the greatness of the danger. They are systematizing their efforts in this direction, by giving a greater degree of attention to their mathematical and scientific studies. Divers works have of late appeared, written by members of that society, which give assurance that they are as ever on the alert to counteract the bane with its antidote. Their influence is not to be measured merely by the number of their literary productions. They have numberless youths under their care, and we are of the impression that they are assiduously sowing in their minds seed which will produce a rich crop of usefulness.

It has been contended that there is no necessity for any preparation to arrest the oncoming tide of infidelity which apparently threatens to inundate the whole field of science. The reason alleged is, that religion has prescription on her side. She has stood for thousands of years, and has ever formed the substratum upon which morality, society, and government have been built; therefore, the strong presumption of truth is with her, and the *onus probandi* upon her adversaries, and not upon her; that she cannot be required to answer objections, nor can apparent objections be deemed disproofs until, first, infidelity has attained to the breadth, general symmetry, and legitimate synthetical arrangement, which characterizes Christianity; until, second, infidelity has given trustworthy guarantees that it will be able to work good instead of harm, to individuals, to society, and to government; third, until there exists a perfect and unanimous agreement among infidels themselves as to the truth of their doctrines. It is further alleged that, as modern infidelity is professedly founded upon the natural sciences, between which and religion there cannot exist any real incompatibility, all that is required is to let infidelity pursue its course, and it will inevitably work out its own condemnation.

This argument is a strong one, and no opportunity should be lost to press it home with effect. But it must not be forgotten that many of those whom infidelity is silently and imperceptibly contaminating, are incompetent to appreciate the force of an argument which to them is merely technical, and not decisive of the merits. In the interim, whilst availing ourselves of this logical vantage-ground, and awaiting the action of the self-corrective power of advancing science, the infidelity of the age will be perverting minds to such an extent as to render the remedy immeasurably more difficult, if not well-nigh impossible. The enemies of religion are ceaselessly active. Every department of literature is fast acquiring the impress of irreligion. All the hundred special sciences are being cast in its mould. It is not the falsity of alleged facts which constitutes the ground of complaint, nor the suppression of material

facts. No, infidelity is conversant with a device worth a thousand such. It is the adjustment and marshalling of all the facts in such a way as to point inevitably to the conclusion which these infidels are desirous of establishing. They concern themselves only with their major and minor, and lay little or no stress upon the conclusion; well knowing, able dialecticians as they are, that the less said about the conclusion the better; for the reader, if left to draw the conclusion, will invest it with the greater strength, in return for the compliment to his intellect, implied by the writer leaving to him that slight intellectual exertion. Furthermore, the plan takes well, because it is made to appear that it needs not sophistry or eloquence to draw the inference, but that it is the inevitable result of the remorseless logic and irresistible eloquence of facts.

The infidelity of this age is not aggressive in appearance. It insinuates its ideas with the craft of the serpent. In every form of literature preparation is made for the introduction of the virus. Even police-court reports cannot give an account of proceedings without the use of terms of expression borrowed from the physical sciences, and fraught with disbelief. Everywhere are to be met expressions which carry with them far more than their literal interpretation will bear, and which derive their commentary from the complexion of the times. Other expressions, equally apparently innocent of assertiveness of infidelity, find attrition in the mind with those stored therein before, and the pernicious idea, flashing as a resultant from the impact, is endowed with convincing power, in direct proportion as its factitious relation and designed adjustment has been ingeniously disguised.

Thus it is that the very well-springs of thought are insidiously poisoned. The deadly tincture lurks even amid forms of literature whose innocent and peaceful aspect would seem to preclude the possibility of harm. Criticisms upon painting, poetry, sculpture, architecture, do not escape the infection. The most generous feelings and best instincts of the heart are perverted, and made the agents of their own eradication. Errors are enticingly incrusted with truths, as is the bitter pill with its sugar coating. Novels and romances are prolific of this deadly nightshade. In them are to be found psychological analyses of character which inculcate principles which, though not repulsive in themselves, are yet, by the manner in which they are instilled, susceptible of an easy and unconscious resolution into further utilitarian, necessitarian, and fatalistic principles, which need only other doses of the same too readily furnished pabulum, to develop, and warp the intellect and taint the moral character. In this way, with diabolic cunning, is the individual slowly prepared for the reception of errors which, before, he would have rejected with horror. These wily advocates

of "modern thought" are too astute to proffer their baneful fruit unheralded. This constitutes the utter absence, in them, of all spirit of proselytism. They plant only the seed in the minds of those they would seduce; they supply it with congenial soil; and they then leave it to its natural growth.

The remedy for this state of affairs is to be found in the scholastic philosophy. The critical genius of that philosophy, and the analytic habits of thought which it engenders, peculiarly fit it for the contest. The infidelity of the present century differs from that of the last century. In the former age, it concerned itself only with attacking and destroying everything which mankind held most dear. In lieu of that which it endeavored to demolish, it had nothing to offer. This fact constituted one of the causes of its ephemeral existence. In this century the needs and wants of the intellect, the craving for something tangible and positive to replace that which is subverted, have been recognized and acted upon. Negations do not satisfy the soul. Mankind are not content with disbelief. They need a system, something in which they can repose faith. Disbelief is unable to stand alone; it needs the support of a complementary belief. It is in the appreciation of this fact that we find the prevailing thirst for systems.

What finer field could there possibly be for the exercise of the analytic genius of the scholastic philosophy, than in the refutation of modern infidelity? Joined to this thought is the consideration that by this dialectical encounter we will be meeting a practical necessity, by creating an intellectual atmosphere that will serve directly as a corrective of the pernicious influences which are insidiously working their way to the souls of thousands whose eternal welfare is thereby endangered.

The present is no time for the construction of a science of the relations between theology and these new departments of knowledge. The natural sciences are not as yet ripe for such a step. Even if they were, policy would dictate that we should not so meet the attacks of the enemy. The aggressive or analytic mode of warfare is preferable to the defensive or synthetic mode. It is more in harmony with the tone of our philosophy, and is more efficient. For, when synthesis is opposed to synthesis, the blow which the weaker receives is by comparison only, and not direct; and therefore is not effective. Besides, acting on the defensive involves the necessity of defining our position with respect to every mushroom hypothesis with which our adversaries insult the name of science. If we fail in establishing the harmony, by reason of the invalidity of the hypothesis, religion has to shoulder the evil effects incident to the failure. If we appear to succeed, the subsequent refutation of the hypothesis whose harmony with our convictions we have

seemingly established, is adduced as an evidence of the subtle ingenuity with which we can, for the nonce, reconcile even an absurdity with our principles. To illustrate what we mean by this synthetic plan, we have only to refer to the many attempts at the reconciliation of Darwinism with religion, with which many well-meaning but foolish persons are wont to entertain us. A cogent reason for the American clergy assuming the direction of religion's response to this intellectual movement, is that laymen are entering the arena, wholly unprepared to treat such problems in the broad and catholic spirit with which they should be handled. Laymen have regard only to isolated problems, and prejudice religion by resort to a diversity of methods which often mutually clash. Religion is then made responsible for this discordance. Among the clergy this difficulty would not obtain. Unity of method and harmony of attack would flow from the comprehensive spirit imbued into them by community of education, and by their acquaintance with the multifold aspects of every problem bearing on religion.

The better plan is to meet all our adversaries' attacks upon their own territory. But to contend successfully against the established evil it is requisite that we should render ourselves familiar with its general complexion, study the sciences which are esteemed its strongholds, adopt its terminology so far as is consistent with our principles; cultivate a readiness in bringing to account its peculiar turns of thought; acquire a knowledge of all the shifts and devices resorted to by the enemy, and turn its weapons against itself. The moral effect of hoisting the engineer with his own petard, should not be disregarded. Apart from this, success is more assured when regard is had to the bent and inclination of the minds of those for whom the arguments are intended. No arms are needed, other than those to be found in the arsenal of the Aristotelian philosophy. All that is required is to secure their attractive presentation by burnishing them up in conformity with the fashion and taste of the age. In the tomes of the scholastics are to be found principles and canons of controversy sufficient for every exigency which has arisen, or which may arise. They need only to be clothed in the current phraseology of the day. Change only the idiom in which they are expressed, and they will meet with a cordial reception from those who are prepossessed against them. As we have before remarked, our adversaries are forestalling us in this respect.

All this does not require a thorough and extended acquaintance with all the details of all the natural sciences. What is needed is not so much a knowledge of the natural sciences, as a knowledge of their philosophy; a full insight into the mode of thought engendered by their study; and an acquaintance with that mode of thought in all its varied phases. An analytical refutation of a con-

clusion cannot be achieved without a knowledge of the premises upon which it is claimed to be based. If place is given in our seminaries—theological and lay—to the study of the mathematical and physical sciences, we shall be able to rout the enemy from the field of science, by conclusively pointing out in detail, supported by direct evidence, that the doubts which our adversaries conjure up, are doubts by reason solely of the imperfect development of the data essential to their dissipation; that the theories in which they would have us believe, are naught but crude and imperfect hypotheses violative, at every stage, of the laws and logic of their own mode of thought; that numberless and important *hiatus* everywhere abound in their boasted discoveries; that many of their laws and canons are not the legitimate outcome of science; that when their laws and canons are the legitimate outcome of science, they complacently ignore them when it subserves their purpose so to do, and substitute therefor canons and laws against which they themselves have, time and again, inveighed; that whenever they aspire above immediate induction, and attempt to co-ordinate the whole field of science with the link of some abstract principle, they not only flagrantly transgress the laws of induction, but, in addition, fall into material errors which are most glaring, and which they themselves condemn in the most unmeasured terms; that, taking for granted and applying the truth of their condemnation of certain philosophic methods, the subversal of their philosophy inevitably follows; that many of their general ideas which they profess to have acquired by induction, insult the very name of induction, and differ from Platonic ideas only in degree; that their generalizations far outstrip the accumulation of facts; that their tentative hypotheses usurp all the prerogatives of well-founded and established theories; that their methods outrage the principles of logic as they themselves define them; that they hasten too fast from the analytic to the synthetic method; that they draw general conclusions from too small a number of particular observations and experiments; that they have altogether lost that spirit of rigorous reserve, of strict cautious prudence, so constantly inculcated by Bacon and Descartes, whom they profess to hold in esteem; that they have repudiated positivism, governed by no other motive than that it bound them down too closely to the observance of their own logic; that the concurrent testimony of their own well-established principles, is that their philosophy, in so far as it conflicts with religion, is naught but a tissue of sophistry and absurdity.

The analytic method here indicated is open to none of the objections urged against the clergy taking part in the controversies of the day. It is superior to the synthetic method in this, that a failure never reacts.

X. C. S. P.

BOOK NOTICES.

SELECTIONS FROM THE TALMUD; being specimens of the contents of that ancient Book, its Commentaries, Teachings, Poetry, and Legends. Also, brief sketches of the men who made and commented upon it. Translated from the original by *H. Polano*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1876. 8vo., pp. 382.

The Jews possess two Talmuds, one known as the Talmud of Jerusalem, the other, that of Babylon; the former compiled at some period between A.D. 150 and 300, the second at a much later date, but certainly before the time of the Masoretes. The Talmud of Jerusalem having special reference to the dwellers in Palestine, never acquired much authority among the Jews outside of the Holy Land. Yet its antiquity gives it some importance, and Lightfoot, amongst others, has used it successfully in illustrating the books and history of the New Testament. It has been superseded by the Talmud of Babylon to such an extent, that whenever the Talmud is spoken of without further adjunct, the Babylonian compilation is always understood.

This is the book from which come the extracts translated by Mr. Polano; and it would not have been amiss, if in the Introduction he had mentioned the difference between the two works. But on the contrary his language (Introduction, page 24) is calculated to mislead an ordinary reader, and leave him under the impression that the two books are one, or rather that there never was more than one Talmud. For he speaks (*ibid.*) of the Mishna as completed in the year 220, received in Judea and Babylonia, and tells us, on page 25, how it was commented on by Rab Ashi and others. This, no doubt, is absolutely true, but inasmuch as it leads the reader to suppose that there is but one Talmud, it is scarcely correct. The true state of the case is as follows: Each Talmud is composed of two parts, the Mishna and the Gemara. The Mishna (a kind of oral Deuteronomy, as its name implies, and rendered quite correctly by the word *δευτερωνις*, in the Novellae of Justinian) is the work of R. Jehudah Hakkadosh, head of the school of Tiberias in Palestine. The Gemara is a commentary, or rather a collection of commentaries, on the Mishna. The existence of the Jerusalem Talmud may be said to date from the completion and publication, by R. Johhannan Bar-Eliezer, of its Gemara, towards the year 300, or, as some put it more definitely, about eighty or a hundred years after the compilation of the Mishna. The Jews of Babylonia, when it was introduced amongst them, became soon dissatisfied with the Jerusalem Gemara; they complained of its obscurity, and of its being ill-adapted to those outside of Palestine, who nevertheless formed the greater portion of the Jewish people. Hence they began commenting on and explaining the Mishna, so as to suit their own condition of exiles in a foreign land. The first to collect these commentaries was R. Ase (or Ashi), aided by R. Abina, about the middle of the fifth century; but the collection was only completed seventy-three years after Ashi's death by R. Jose, chief teacher in the Jewish school of Pumbeditha. This collection, or Gemara, together with the Mishna, constitutes the Talmud of Babylon, of which the best edition is that of *Surenhusius* (Amsterdam, 1698-1703).

The Talmud is a book which may be considered as almost unknown in our country. Even in Europe the knowledge of its contents is confined to the higher class of biblical scholars. It is falsely imagined by too many that Reuchlin was the first Christian who made a thorough study

of the Talmud ; and the tale is, of course, willingly accepted by those who believe that the age of great scholars began only with the era of the Reformation. But though Reuchlin was a learned man and a good Catholic, he must not be praised beyond his due. He had many predecessors, amongst whom it is sufficient to mention the illustrious Dominican, Raymund Martin, who lived in the thirteenth century, and than whom few have penetrated farther into the hidden recesses of the Talmud and of Rabbinical literature.

Though so little known, the Talmud is a book which should not be neglected. It is a mine of information in regard to all matters connected with Hebrew archæology, and this in turn throws light on many passages of the Old and New Testaments. And this constitutes its chief value to the Christian student. Any other advantage to be derived from it is principally historical, since in its pages we are enabled to trace the gradual growth and development of those "traditions of men," super-added by human caprice to the divine law, so often condemned by our Lord in His Gospel, and denounced as an unbearable yoke by the Prince of the Apostles (Acts xv. 10). Besides, in a controversial point of view its study may furnish Christianity with weapons against Judaism ; and this use has been made of it successfully by Raymund Martin, Porchet, Galatinus, and others. Otherwise the Talmud is a vast mass of incoherent theological and canonical opinions, fanciful legends, pretended historical details, which are mere fables ; shameless tales, no less filthy than extravagant, with a large admixture of blasphemy that insults not only our holy religion and its Divine Founder, but even the saints of the Old Testament and the Lord God of Israel, whom the Talmudists professed to worship. The curious reader may see specimens of this blasphemous ribaldry, with which we could not sully our pages, in the second book of the *Bibliotheca Sancta of Sixtus Senensis*. Any one having Milante's edition (Naples, 1742), which is the best, will find them on page 206, of the first volume. Or if he wish to consult a more modern author, he will find enough to convince him in Eisenmenger's work, entitled *Judaism Unveiled*.

It was on account of these horrible blasphemies that so many copies of the Talmud were burnt between three and four centuries ago, by the ecclesiastical authorities of Germany and Italy. The attention of both people and magistrates had been drawn to them by Jewish converts in books published in the vernacular ; and such appeal, being made to the public at large rather than to scholars or church authorities, made severe measures a matter of necessity. This, too, it was, that roused the indignation of the Pféfferkorns, Hochstrats, and others, to such a pitch that they clamored for an imperial edict, which should consign to the flames all Jewish books, indiscriminately, with the sole exception of the Bible. But this blind, intemperate zeal was checked by the enlightened policy of the Holy See, which, while perpetually watching over the interests of religion, never forgets that she is also the guardian of whatever is good and wholesome in science and letters. Much of the credit of this victory of good taste and good sense over wild, unreasoning zeal, is due to the efforts of the learned Reuchlin. And his victory would have been more complete had it not been tarnished (to say nothing of his own imprudence) by the applause so lavishly showered on him by the disciples of the great revolt against the Church, then beginning in Europe, and especially by that infamous profligate, equally detestable for his life and writings, Ulrich von Hutten. No cause, however good, but is dishonored by such championship ; and the just man, even in serving God, may find room to fear that his service is not what it ought to be,

when he sees it welcomed with plaudits by those who are enemies of God and man.

The absurd fables and blasphemies of the Talmud have given offence not only to Christians, but to Jews likewise. Nor do we speak only or principally of those rationalistic Jews, who have exchanged their religion for freemasonry and infidelity, but of some among their predecessors who were steadfast in their adherence to the law of Moses. Thus Maimonides, a Rabbi of the twelfth century, and one of the most learned men of modern Judaism, shows a wise discretion which entitles him to great credit. In his commentaries on the Talmud, which are esteemed the best of their class, discarding all the objectionable matter as unworthy of notice, he has confined himself exclusively to the legal and ritual parts of the book.

In reprinting the Talmud, Catholic editors thought it expedient to omit the portions of it which assail Christianity, and their example has been imitated by some Protestants. Thus in the edition printed by Frobenius at Bâle, 1678, and in that of Frankfort on the Oder, 1697, the whole treatise, called *Aboda Sara*, has been omitted. And it is strange so accurate a writer as Wolf, in his *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, should have fallen into the mistake of asserting that the Hamburg edition just mentioned contains the *Aboda Sara*.

The translator of the work before us has followed, we are glad to see, the good example of Maimonides. Carefully throwing aside whatever is grossly fabulous, antichristian, and impious, he culls from the whole whatever is most pleasant and agreeable in legend, proverb, and parable, and most wholesome in moral teaching, and lays it, sometimes in full, sometimes in abridged form, before his readers. On the whole he has done his work well and judiciously enough; and, taking into consideration that the language into which he translates (as we judge from some passages) is not his native tongue, his English is remarkably good and correct. We do not approve, however, of all that the translator says in his Introduction and Chronological Table; for his facts do not always rest on a strictly historical basis. But we must say for him, that he has studiously avoided any expression that might offend Christian ears. The only exception, perhaps, occurs on page 247, where it is said that the death of Maimonides was mourned alike by his own people and by the Gentile. Now *Gentile*, in Jewish phraseology, is simply our *Heathen*. We cannot, or will not, complain that in their creeds and liturgies, and even in their domestic vocabulary, the Jews should call us by the opprobrious name of *Heathens*, *Gojim*; for such they hold that we are. But social courtesy, it might be supposed, would forbid the use of such terms in a book intended for the perusal of Christians. Yet some good may come of it. Perhaps some grim, self-satisfied Puritan or Evangelical, as he stands up before the altar, thanking God that he is not like other men, and especially the deluded victims of Roman superstition, may be chastened in spirit by the remembrance that, though in his own opinion he is one of the saints born to rule the earth and enjoy the fulness thereof, nevertheless, in the opinion of many (whose learning and honest conviction he cannot deny), he is merely the brother-heathen of the unhappy Papist, whose idolatry he so fiercely denounces.

The Talmud, like all Rabbinical literature, is rich in allegory and parables, which from time immemorial have been in the East the favorite mode of conveying moral instruction. As a specimen, we take the following from Mr. Polano's translation. It contains a good lesson, by which any Christian may profit:

"A certain man had three friends. One of these he loved dearly;

the second he loved also, but not as intensely as the first; but towards the third one he was quite indifferently disposed. Now the king of the country sent an officer to this man, commanding his immediate appearance before the throne. Greatly terrified was the man at this summons. He thought that somebody had been speaking evil of him, or probably accusing him falsely before his sovereign, and being afraid to appear unaccompanied before the royal presence, he resolved to ask one of his friends to go with him. First, he naturally applied to his dearest friend, but he at once declined to go, giving no reason and no excuse for his lack of friendliness. So the man applied to his second friend, who said to him:

“ ‘ I will go with thee as far as the palace gates, but I will not enter with thee before the king.’

“ In desperation the man applied to his third friend, the one whom he had neglected, but who replied to him at once:

“ ‘ Fear not: I will go with thee, and I will speak in thy defence. I will not leave thee until thou art delivered from thy trouble.’

“ The ‘first friend’ is a man’s wealth, which he must leave behind him when he dies. The ‘second friend’ is typified by the relatives, who follow him to the grave, and leave him when the earth has covered his remains. The ‘third friend,’ he who entered with him into the presence of the king, is as the good deeds of a man’s life, which never desert, but accompany him to plead his cause before the King of kings, who regardeth not person nor taketh bribery.” (Pp. 370-371.)

AN EXPOSITION OF THE GOSPELS, consisting of an Analysis of each Chapter and of a Commentary, Critical, Exegetical, Doctrinal, and Moral, by the *Most Rev. Dr. McEvilly*, Bishop of Galway. Dublin: W. B. Kelly. New York: Benziger & Bros. 1876. 8vo., pp. 675. Vol. 1st, comprising the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark.

The name of Bishop McEvilly is not unknown to biblical scholars. A worthy successor of the Narys, Dixons, and McCarthys, he has already distinguished himself by an *Exposition of the Pauline and Catholic Epistles*. The present work when finished will complete his *Commentary on the New Testament*, with the exception of the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse, to which we hope the author will next turn his attention. We have not had time to read over carefully the entire work, but we have examined it sufficiently to satisfy ourselves that it is unquestionably a valuable accession to English Catholic biblical literature. Bishop McEvilly, following the sensible practice of most Catholic commentators, concerns himself more with the kernel than the shell that incloses it; in other words, busies himself more with investigating the true meaning of the text, than with a display of verbal criticism and that far-fetched erudition, which is so profusely paraded in the commentaries of heterodox and rationalist interpreters. This pompous show is simply meant to hide their emptiness and want of substance in what is most essential. Our author has quite enough of erudition and critical exegesis to satisfy not only the ordinary reader, but even the biblical student; what, however, he has had principally in view is the doctrinal and moral teaching of the Gospel, in drawing which out he is full, and at times perhaps even diffuse.

It may be to some a matter of surprise that the good bishop should have found time, amid the onerous and incessant duties of his Episcopal office, to compile these massive octavos, of which the Irish Catholic Church may be justly proud. They show evidently that the Catholic clergy of that country cultivate earnestly the study of Scripture them-

selves, and do their best to facilitate its study for others. And thus they furnish a sufficient answer to the host of ignorant and wicked scribblers, who are never tired of repeating that the Catholic clergy of all countries, and especially of Ireland, strive to make of the Bible a hidden or forbidden book, and do their utmost, out of fear, to suppress all knowledge of its contents. None have been louder, none more obstinate and envenomed in reiterating this wicked slander than the ministers of the Irish Establishment, now happily extinct. And nothing could be more brazen or shameless on their part, because in thus slandering the Catholic clergy, they are actually, though very unwisely, painting themselves to the life. For, of all Protestant churches (and our author calls attention to the fact in his introduction, page vi.) the Anglican Irish Church is the only one that has never produced a single biblical scholar. It will not do to quote such names as Bedell, Jebb, Mant, and others, to prove the contrary. These were all Englishmen, to whom livings in the Irish Church were assigned by way of reward or encouragement. It is an incontestable fact, that no Irish Anglican has ever written a line to illustrate the language of the sacred text, or interpret its meaning. Yet they had no lack of time or means, enjoying abundant revenues and having no care of souls to interfere with their studies.

There is in the end a brief Errata-corrigé. It would be well to add to it the words "*to call*," on p. 17, l. 39. They should read, "*to be called*."

DARWINIANA: Essays and Reviews pertaining to Darwinism. By *Asa Gray Fisher*, Professor of Natural History (Botany) in Harvard University. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1876.

The literary virtues of this readable book may be extolled. It is neither dull nor heavy. Its perusal demands just that degree of intellectual exertion which is a pleasure, and will attract those who are conversant with the facts of Darwinism, and will be read by all whose culture prompts them to skim the current of modern thought. A fair conception of the scope and object of the work may be derived from the preface. The author therein says, it is written "by a practical naturalist, versed in one department only (viz., Botany)," "one who is scientifically, and in his own fashion, a Darwinian, philosophically a convinced theist, and religiously an acceptor of the 'creed commonly called the Nicene.'" "Some of these pages are written in a lightness of vein not quite congruous with the gravity of the subject and the seriousness of its issues." "Some of the essays, however, may redress the balance, and be thought sufficiently heavy, if not solid." "Long before our last article was written it could be affirmed that the general doctrine of the derivation of species (to put it comprehensively) has prevailed over that of specific creation, at least to the extent of being the received, and presumably in some sense, true conception." "This applies especially to what may be called deductive evolution—a subject which lay beyond the writer's scope, and to which neither the bent of his mind nor the line of his studies has fitted him to do justice."

Thus we are furnished with another contribution to the literature of Darwinism; and yet, giving the writer due credit for his unquestionable ability, and for his industrious studies in the department of science to which he has specially devoted himself, we cannot perceive that his book throws much light upon the disputed questions.

We do not say this to the disparagement of the author. It would, indeed, be unfair to expect him, or any other mere physicist, to make any great advance towards a solution of the fundamental questions involved

in the debate now going on respecting the origin of species, their fixity, or their transmutation. Owing to the method employed by physicists in their investigations and speculations, their labors cannot possibly result in anything beyond probable theories. Besides, until more exact definitions are adopted and strictly adhered to by modern scientists, most of their contests resolve themselves, in the end, into mere logomachies. Moreover, the questions which modern scientists assume to discuss, are questions which do not really belong to them. They are outside of, and beyond their sphere.

To the author's statement, in the last sentence we have quoted, many persons will take exception, and justly. Though the tendency is quite general amongst modern physicists to fall in with Darwin, yet to assert that his idea has prevailed over that of specific creation is to claim too much. Not all physicists have as yet become Darwinians, nor have the opponents of Darwinism been reduced to silence.

SCHOOLS AND MASTERS OF PAINTING; with an Appendix on the Principal Galleries of Europe. By A. G. Radcliffe. Illustrated. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1876. 8vo., pp. 575.

The author has given us a book of very pleasant and instructive reading. His judgment of the merits of the old masters are in the main correct, because generally derived from competent authority. After a brief sketch of painting among the pagan nations of antiquity, he traces the history of the art from the period of the Catacombs down to our day. Even from this necessarily brief survey it plainly results, as our author acknowledges (p. 58), "that the Church and the traditions of the Church were the first motive powers in art as well as in literature." And this is true not only of painting in the early ages of the Church, but also of its *renaissance* or restoration three or four centuries ago. We should have at this day none of those many wonderful triumphs of art which delight thousands of beholders, and serve as models to quicken the genius and direct the progress of disciples, had it not been for the inspiration of Religion, the fostering care of the Church, and the enlightened munificence of her spiritual princes. The so-called Reformation dried up the well-spring of religious art; and in the countries that fell under its baleful influence we find here and there an exceptional case of a painter, but seldom or never one who can aspire to a place near the great masters.

It is so usual to find writers outside of the Church scoffing at all that is holy and wonderful in the lives and actions of our Saints, that we cannot conceal our surprise and gratification in seeing the calm, dispassionate, almost reverential tone in which Mr. Radcliffe narrates (chap. v.) the legends of the Blessed Virgin, the Apostles, Saints Sebastian, Lawrence, Cecilia, Agnes, Catharine, and others, whose deeds or sufferings form the most frequent subject of Catholic painting. There is no fliprant word, no levity, much less any disposition shown to sneer; and for this, though it be mere justice, we have to thank him. Mr. Radcliffe calls them legends; but there is in them a great deal more of historical truth than he is aware of. Not all that is based on tradition is legendary. It must be either a slip of the pen or of memory, that makes him, in one place, class Gospel facts under the head of traditions and legends. Speaking of Duccio's *Entry into Jerusalem*, he says (p. 75): "An animated crowd throngs forth to meet the Redeemer, who rides with dignity on the traditional ass." Now if the author will only open King James's Bible, and look into the 21st chapter of St. Matthew, the 11th of St.

Mark, the 19th of St. Luke, and the 12th of St. John, he will find that this incident is no idle fancy, but an historical truth, foretold by the prophet Zachariah, and put on record by the four Evangelists. We fear that Mr. Radcliffe is rusty in his Bible reading, and that he has confounded Christ's entry into Jerusalem with His birth in the manger. That an ox and an ass were present on the latter occasion rests only on a tradition, rejected by Tillemont, Calmet, and others, but admitted by many good critics and supported by the testimony of St. Jerome, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and other Fathers.

On page 65 we read as follows: "At the close of the fifth century the Virgin and Child were represented together; not in reference to any divine element in the Mother, but to express a belief in the humanity as well as the divinity of the Son, which had been questioned by Nestorian heretics. The reverence paid to the one was, however, soon extended to the other, till both were honored and at last worshipped." Mr. Radcliffe here coolly takes for granted, as if it were an evident, undeniable fact, that the faith of the Church, East and West, as to the honor due to the Blessed Virgin, is different now from what it was at the close of the fifth century. The Church of that day, he thinks, recognized no "divine element in the Mother, but in progress of time it *divinized* or deified Her." Where did he learn this? No doubt he believes, in some general way, what he says; but this is no excuse, for he *ought* to know better. Nor will the Great Judge hold guiltless any man pretending to education who recklessly hurls at His Church the foul charge of idolatry, on the mere plea that in childhood he was so taught in the Sunday-school or from the pulpit. That the Blessed Virgin is divine, or anything more than a creature, however exalted in dignity, was never taught in any creed or doctrinal standard of the Church. And no man, possessing a conscience or common honesty, should presume to state what our belief is, without first consulting them. We invoke Her intercession and honor Her, for She deserves it; but the honor we give Her falls infinitely short of what we give to God. This is what is taught our children in their catechism, and what is taught those who are one day to be the teachers of the people, in their text-books of Theology.

MITCHELL'S NEW GEOGRAPHIES. J. H. Butler & Co., Philadelphia.

SADLIER'S EXCELSIOR SERIES OF GEOGRAPHIES. William H. Sadlier, New York.

THE COMPREHENSIVE SERIES OF GEOGRAPHIES. P. O'Shea, publisher, New York.

The progress of geographical knowledge has been very rapid of late years, and requires frequent changes, not only in maps, but also in the text of school geographies. On the one hand, travellers in countries as yet only partially explored and imperfectly known, particularly in Asia, Africa, and Oceanica, and also, though to a less extent, in North and South America, are constantly communicating new and important information as regards the regions they traverse; and, on the other hand, the effects of wars and of new political arrangements, and also those consequent upon the developments of peaceful industry, the movements of trade, the diversion of commerce into new channels, and the advance of education, are constantly producing great changes in the social condition, and statistics, habits, employments, religious practices, intellectual status, density of population, and relative importance of old and of new countries, cities, and towns,—all of which should be noted and described as soon as possible in text-books, designed to impart to the pupils who use them, an accurate knowledge of the world, not as it was in a past generation, but as it now is.

MITCHELL'S SERIES.

In looking over the various works which go to make up the two series of Mitchell's Geographies we have been greatly impressed with the judicious arrangement of topics, the correctness, conciseness, and clearness of statement and description, and fulness of knowledge imparted, which characterize all of them. The maps are accurate and distinct, and are so planned and executed that though those of the advanced series are very full of details, yet the eye is not wearied in examining them, but can readily trace out the contour of coast-lines, the capes and promontories, bays and gulfs, that indent the seacoast; the boundaries of the different countries, the courses of rivers, ranges of mountains, lines of railways, situations of towns and cities, etc., etc.

As text-books, designed for use in non-Catholic schools, as well as Catholic, they are singularly free from statements objectionable to Catholics. One such statement has met our eye, and only one, that seemed to us to require a slight alteration. It crept in, we are sure, inadvertently, and we doubt not but that it is only necessary to direct the attention of the liberal-minded publishers to it, or to any other such expressions (if any there are), to secure immediately the desired modification. We are not surprised, therefore, that these Geographies have secured such general use in Catholic schools and academies, and have received numerous high commendations from distinguished Catholic prelates, and principals of Catholic educational institutions.

The *New Physical Geography* is an admirable text-book. When we recall to mind what the Physical Geographies used in schools fifteen or twenty years ago were, we can scarcely credit the improvement which this one has achieved, as regards simplicity of method, clearness of statement and description, and general adaptation to the youthful mind. By a happy system of arrangement, beginning with the simplest elements, combining numerous well-executed pictorial illustrations with clear and concise explanations, the pupil is carried forward through the many subjects comprised in a study of Physical Geography,—the geological conformation of the earth, its chief physical features, its systems of mountains, valleys, and plateaus; its rivers and ocean currents; the direction and force of prevailing winds, and the combined influence of all these upon climate, the changes of temperature, the rainfall, and deposit of dew, the phenomena of electricity, etc., etc.,—in such way that without confusion of mind and with no more than a reasonable degree of thought and industry, clear and intelligent ideas upon all these subjects will be attained.

THE EXCELSIOR SERIES.

Mr. Sadlier's series of Geographies consists of three numbers, or books. The preface to the *Primary Geography* states that it is based on the object-system of teaching, and is designed to combine "the greatest simplicity with no inconsiderable amount of geographical information." The illustrations, therefore, are quite numerous, and are always suggestive of the subject-matter of the accompanying text. The lessons are very properly thrown into the form of question and answer. The questions are direct, easily comprehended, and so arranged that each grows naturally out of the one preceding. The maps, as is quite proper in a primary geography, give merely the coast-lines, boundaries, principal rivers, and chains of mountains, and chief cities of the different countries and states. These are all distinctly marked, so that the eye of the young beginner in geography will readily catch them.

Number two is based upon the same general principle as number one,

and is a further development of it. This number is intended for pupils somewhat more advanced. The questions and answers are, consequently, more numerous and comprehensive, and the maps are fuller in details. The map-questions are quite numerous, and when mastered will secure quite accurate knowledge of the physical features and political divisions of countries, etc., etc.

Number three is designed for pupils still further advanced. The subject-matter of the text is well arranged and expressed. In addition to the descriptive and physical geography of each country, there is also a short synopsis of the chief events of its history. This narrative is necessarily brief, but, at the same time, it is comprehensive enough to give the pupil a correct general idea of the history of the country he is studying.

This feature of the *Excelsior Geography* is the more important as it guards the mind of the pupil, to some extent at least, against the falsehoods and misrepresentations current in respect to countries that have been, or still are, inhabited by Catholics, and gives him correct impressions at an age when impressions are most easily made, and when made are most permanent.

The maps in this number are fuller of details than those of numbers one and two. They have been taken by permission, as have also some of the illustrations and portions of the text of the work from Monteith's *Series of Geographies*. This we mention not as a defect or objection, but as a guarantee of their general excellence. They are so drawn and colored that the outlines of the different countries, mountains, and rivers are brought prominently into view. The illustrations are a great improvement upon those usual in school books. They serve to give the pupil a very correct idea of the scenery of different countries, and the distinctive features, dress, and industrial employments of their peoples, and of the architectural style of their public buildings.

The *Physical and Commercial Chart of the World*, and the Chart showing the comparative sizes of states and kingdoms, add to the value of the work, as do also three maps illustrative of Ancient Geography, viz., a map of the Roman Empire and surrounding regions; a map of Italy, with a subordinate map of the vicinity of Ancient Rome, and a map of Ancient Greece. In connection with these maps there is a brief synopsis of the history of Ancient Greece and Rome.

THE COMPREHENSIVE SERIES.

The number before us is the third of the series. Having had no opportunity of examining the first and second numbers, we are unable to say how or to what extent they prepare pupils for this more advanced Geography. If, however, they are equal, on their respective planes, to number three, we have no hesitation in saying that the whole series is one of rare excellence.

The scope of number three is, as its title indicates, very comprehensive. It comprises not only topical, political, and statistical Geography, but also physical and historical. The arrangement of topics is good, and their treatment lucid and sufficiently full to inform the mind of the pupil.

We have examined with special care the portions bearing upon Physical Geography and Historical Geography. It is not an easy task to combine these with topical, statistical, and political geography in one book without making it cumbrous in size, and sacrificing unity and simplicity of method. Yet the author of the book before us seems to have done this quite successfully. Without going as thoroughly into the causes of

things, as would have been proper and possible in a work treating professedly on the physical conformation of the earth and its climates, etc., etc., the author has, nevertheless, succeeded in imparting, in a manner easily comprehended and without breaking the continuity of topics, a large amount of valuable information in regard to the climates, the causes that determine them, and the vegetable productions of each country.

In separate chapters, in connection with the geography of each country, its history is given, briefly yet clearly. The author has been very successful in this—a work of no small difficulty. To students who have not time to take up Physical Geography and History as distinct branches of study, the *Comprehensive Geography* is an admirable text-book.

The maps are clear in outline, accurate, and distinct. The illustrations deserve high commendation. They are well chosen as to subject, artistically well conceived, and beautifully executed. They are, on the whole, we think, the finest we have seen in any school-book. In thus commanding the illustrations we must make one exception. In the cut representing the different manners of worship, or "Symbols of the Principal Religions," Christianity has as its symbolical representation a luminous cross above, and an angel as its central figure pointing with outstretched arm to a book with the words HOLY BIBLE inscribed on its open pages. The erroneous impression thus suggested to the pupil, especially in the absence of any symbol of the Church and of the Holy Sacrifice, it is not necessary for us to dwell on. It must have been purely through oversight that this illustration has been admitted into a text-book designed specially for use in Catholic schools and academies.

We attempt no comparison between any of the three series of geographical text-books just noticed. Their respective merits and advantages are various: and intelligent and experienced persons will probably be divided in opinion as to which is the best. Probably each, under a given set of circumstances and for pupils of different educational status and intentions, might in turn be preferred.

We are heartily glad, that two such excellent series of Catholic Geographies have been published. The providing of suitable text-books for Catholic schools is by no means a light undertaking, nor can its importance well be overestimated. The text-books prepared for non-Catholic schools, and which, in the absence of any other text-books had to be used, until quite recently, in Catholic schools, are (with a few honorable exceptions, among which are the Mitchell Series) full of untrue and anti-Catholic statements wherever the subjects of religion, and history, and the condition of Catholic countries and peoples are touched upon. Both Mr. Sadlier and Mr. O'Shea deserve great credit for what they have done.

A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES. By
John O'Kane Murray, B. S.

Mr. Murray's book brings together a good deal of valuable information that otherwise could be found only with great difficulty, scattered as it is in so many books and other sources, becoming from day to day less accessible. It is not a history in the proper sense of the word, but a repertory rather of materials, good and indifferent, from which by culling and sifting a history might be constructed. Mr. Murray, however, is not far beside the mark, when he calls it a "popular" work; for we feel quite sure that there is a large class of readers in this country who will give his work a warm welcome. The style, we regret to see, is not always in keeping with the gravity and dignity that should charac-

terize a work intended to be a permanent contribution to American Catholic history. It is in some places declamatory, with a smack of the stump-speech or the ephemeral newspaper article. It may be added that there are some errors, which indicate that the book was compiled in such haste as to leave the writer no time for revision, no opportunity to test his statements by reference to the proper authorities. It was probably the ambition, otherwise laudable, of bringing out his book in the Centennial year that hurried our author; but a little patience in order to secure accuracy, would have been preferable. It would not have cost him much time or pains to discover that neither Charles Botta (p. 496), nor Father Tongiorgi, nor Balmes (p. 541) can be called American Catholic writers. One might with equal justice put in the same category Count Carli, or Archbishop Dixon of Armagh, or the witty Monseigneur Segur, since the first is the author of the celebrated *Lettere Americane* (that merited the praise of Franklin), the second wrote a text-book used for biblical study in some of our Seminaries, and the works of the third have been translated for our benefit. There is also in the book an anecdote or two which it would have been wiser to omit. For, if the book live to see another Centennial year, we fear that the American Catholics of that day will not be edified, and will wish they had remained unwritten.

Faultfinding is not agreeable to us, but disagreeable duties must be performed as well as others. And if the author will only bear in mind the excellent principles laid down by himself (p. 553) touching the duties of a Catholic reviewer, he will be more thankful for our mild criticism, than for the extravagant, unmeaning praise, that has been heaped upon his book in some quarters.

FRANCISCAN MISSIONS AMONG THE COLLIERS AND IRONWORKERS OF MONMOUTH-SHIRE. London: Burns & Oates. 1876.

This is a very interesting little volume. It narrates in a simple style the commencement, by the Franciscan Fathers, of a mission in Monmouthshire, at Pontypool, which was subsequently extended to Abersychan, Cwmbran, Blaenavon, Risca, Blackwood, and Abertillery.

The condition of the people whom this mission was specially designed to reach is described as most deplorable. They were chiefly of Irish descent, "scattered in groups here and there among the hills, or huddled together in the meanest and dirtiest corners of mean and dirty towns, employed in the hardest and worst-paid work, and subjected to every species of annoyance and insult on account of their faith—dim and flickering as its light had become in their poor worn-out hearts."

The mission amongst these people of which the book before us gives an account, was commenced in May, 1860, at the request of the Bishop of Menevia. Father Elzear was sent by the Superior of the Capuchin Monastery, at Pantasaph, in North Wales, to begin it. He went forth "without purse or script," having to borrow money to pay his railroad fare. In the whole region of his mission, comprising twelve square miles, "there was no Catholic church or chapel save a small edifice at Pontypool scarcely sufficient to contain two hundred persons; no school, no appliances of any kind for working a mission, even on the smallest scale, still less for doing what Father Elzear had been sent to do—establishing a community."

Father Elzear at once saw that he must have a school for the children, and this, like his mission, was commenced without money. Providence sent a teacher in a lady, a convert from Protestantism, who was willing to devote herself to the work.

The hearts of the poor children opened to good impressions. They soon became missionaries in their own way, and brought not only children, but a dozen of "tall men," whom one of the boys introduced by saying, "These 'ere chaps knows nought about sin, so I tell'd 'em a bit, and now you can learn 'em some more." Soon young men and women came in numbers, night after night, to be taught the first principles of religion. Very few of them could read, and "prayers and catechism had to be instilled into them by constant repetition."

The narrative shows the thick darkness that enshrouds the working classes in England, and how self-denying, persevering, and faithful labor can cause spiritual light to shine into the hearts of those poor people, despite the darkness that surrounds them, and in the midst of which they are dwelling.

THE FIRST TWO STUARTS AND THE PURITAN REVOLUTION, 1603-1660. By *Samuel Rawson Gardiner*, late Student of Christ Church; Corresponding Member of the Massachusetts Historical Society; Lecturer on Modern History at King's College, London. New York: Scribner & Co. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co.

This book is well adapted, as regards style and arrangement of materials, to the evident design of the writer, which is the historical vindication of Puritanism during the reigns of James I., Charles I., and the rule of Oliver Cromwell. A tone of moderation is assumed and a seeming calmness of statement, well calculated to allay any suspicions that may arise in the minds of readers as to the author's fairness. General reflections, too, are interwoven into the thread of the narrative in such manner as to induce the idea that he is not acting the part of an advocate, but discharging the duty simply of a dispassionate and impartial historian.

Yet to call the work a history is to misname it entirely. It is throughout a plea framed so as to effect its purpose, not so much by *suggestio falsi*, as by *suppressio veri*. One who depended upon it for his knowledge of the leading personages and events of the first two-thirds of the seventeenth century would form an entirely incorrect idea of them. He would not have the slightest conception of the real nature of the struggles that then convulsed England, Scotland, and Ireland; of the violent passions engendered, nor of the horrible cruelties inflicted on the vanquished. The fanatical absurdities and excesses of the various sects and parties, which may be classed under the general term of Puritans, are all thrown into the background, and so lightly touched upon, that no one, from the account which the writer of this book has drawn up, would even suspect their real character and extent.

MEMOIRS OF THE RIGHT REV. SIMON WILLIAM GABRIEL BRUTE, D.D., First Bishop of Vincennes; with Sketches of Scenes connected with the French Revolution, and Extracts from his Journal. By the Right Rev. *James Roosevelt Bayley*, D.D., Bishop of Newark (now most Rev. Archbishop of Baltimore). New York: The Catholic Publication Society, No. 9 Warren Street, 1876.

The labors of Bishop Bruté after he came to the United States, his saintly character, and the services he rendered to religion are known in a general way to Catholics. But little, however, is known of his antecedent history. The work before us is made up mainly from Bishop Bruté's papers and journal, and is especially interesting on this account. It brings before us the youthful medical student, living a pure, consistent, Christian life in the midst of terrible temptations, the Seminarian devoutly making his preparation for the high office of the Priest-

hood. It gives us an insight, which we could obtain from no other source, into his character, motives, and interior Christian life.

Bishop Bruté was an eye-witness to many of the horrid scenes of the French Revolution. He made notes of what transpired under his own notice. These notes, and the portions of Bishop Bruté's journal which Archbishop Bayley has incorporated into his book, add both to its interest and its value. They form a vivid picture of the war which then was waged against religion, of the persecutions which faithful Christians then had to endure, and of the devotion and heroism of very many of the French clergy.

THEORY OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION. By *Charles Fourier*. With an Introduction by *Albert Brisbane*. New York: C. P. Somerby. 1876.

If men were automatic machines, and society the joint result of their arrangement and combination into a greater and more complex mechanism, there would be some sense in Fourierism. The notion which underlies it, however, is not a new one. It is nothing more than a reproduction, and adaptation to modern modes of thought, of some very old errors. The work before us is a fair illustration of the degree of insanity which a man can arrive at, who, starting from a purely materialistic principle, undertakes to construct in his own mind a complete plan for the development of individual men, and their harmonious action in society.

Evil, according to the author, is simply the result of social and physical disorders. The elimination of evil is to be looked for when the physical world shall have attained perfect development, and society shall have been totally reconstructed. The writer sees clearly how this is to be accomplished, and plans it out, in all its numerous details, to his own perfect satisfaction. As a specimen of philosophy run mad, the book is to be commended.

TWO THOUSAND YEARS AFTER; OR, A TALK IN A CEMETERY. By *John Darby*, author of *Thinkers and Thinking*, *Odd Hours of a Physician*, etc. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1876. 12mo., pp. 106.

This little work, small in size, but evidently the result of much and patient thought, is a philosophical dialogue, after the manner of the ancients, on such vital subjects as Matter, the Soul, and God. We can now only acknowledge the receipt of the volume, and reserve a more extended notice of it for the January number of the *Quarterly*.

THE AMERICAN STATE AND AMERICAN STATESMEN. By *William Giles Dix*. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. 1876. 12mo., pp. 171.

AN ESSAY; CONTRIBUTING TO A PHILOSOPHY OF LITERATURE. By *B. A. M.* Second Revised Edition. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1876. 12mo., pp. 208.

ST. THOMAS, OF CANTERBURY. A DRAMATIC POEM. By *Aubrey De Vere*, author of *Alexander the Great*. London: Henry S. King & Co. 1876. 18mo., pp. 267.

ESSAYS ON CATHOLICISM, LIBERALISM, AND SOCIALISM. By *John Donoso Cortes*. Translated by *Rev. William McDonald, S. T. L.*, Rector of the Irish College, Salamanca, Dublin. William B. Kelly. 1874.

These works are too important to be passed over with a brief notice, and our want of space would allow of no other. They will be reviewed fully in our next issue.

MAR 4 1966

PERIODICAL

70734

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

